

NOV 2 12

D. P. molter

---

TERMS—\$2.50 a year, in advance.

75 cents per copy

---

THE

# LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

CONDUCTED BY

J. A. SINGMASTER, D. D.

FREDERICK G. GOTWALD, D. D.

JACOB A. CLUTZ, D. D.

---

VOL. XLII—NO. 4.

---

OCTOBER, 1912.

---

Entered at the Gettysburg Post-office as second-class matter.  
GETTYSBURG, PA.

COMPILER PRINT  
1912

## CONTENTS.

I. THE NEW HIERARCHY.....	481
BY PROFESSOR DAVID H. BAUSLIN, D.D.	
II. THE OPPORTUNITY OF LUTHERANS.....	508
BY REV. W. A. LAMBERT.	
III. THE RITSCHLIAN THEOLOGY.....	515
BY WILLIAM ROSENSTENGEL, D.D.	
IV. STEPS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF NEW TESTAMENT INTERPRETATION.....	528
BY PROFESSOR V. G. A. TRESSLER, D.D., PH.D.	
V. THE LANGUAGE PROBLEM IN NEW TESTAMENT TIMES.....	544
BY CHARLES W. SUPER, LL.D.	
VI. THE MINISTER AND MODERN THOUGHT.....	554
BY REV. EDWIN HEYL DELK, D.D.	
VII. THE DISCIPLINE AND WORSHIP OF THE CHURCH OF THE MIDDLE AGES.....	577
BY REV. C. W. HEATHCOTE.	
VIII. CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.....	584
I. IN ENGLISH. BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.	
II. IN GERMAN. BY PROFESSOR ARDEL ROSS WENTZ, A.M., B.D.	
IX. REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.....	603
Daily Meditations upon the Epistle Lessons of the Church Year— The Lutheran Sunday School Hand Book—Moral Leadership and the Ministry—Miscellanies—The Philosophy of the Future—Historical Setting of the Early Gospel—The Recovery of the Ancient Orient— Egypt to Canaan, or Lectures on the Spiritual Meaning of Exodus— The Apostles' Creed—The Synoptic Problem—Some Moral Reasons for Belief in the Godhead of Jesus Christ—Religious Education in the Home—Dynamic Christianity—The Underworld and the Upper— The Theology of a Preacher—The Rise of the Modern Spirit in Eu- rope—Biblical and Theological Studies—The Higher Critical Quan- dary—The Antiquity of Hebrew Writing and Literature—The Re- ligion of Science—The Dry Dock of a Thousand Wrecks—The Man with a Conscience—Lame and Lovely.	

# THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

OCTOBER, 1912.

---

## ARTICLE I.

### THE NEW HIERARCHY.

BY PROFESSOR DAVID H. BAUSLIN, D.D.

This is the day of the expert. But the fact that a man is alleged to be an expert provides no assurance of freedom from error. This is the period of the specialist, but specialization is an industry that is sometimes confessedly overdone with the resultant of a man who has become lop-sided and perverted. The mere fact of unusual attainments in Semitic languages is for an example no guarantee of the infallibility of judgment even in questions of Old Testament criticism. The same is true of Greek, archaeology or any other factor involved in a thorough and reverent study of the sacred writings. There is such a thing as announcing as indisputable truths, mere opinions which have been based upon an incomplete knowledge of the subject and the bias of personal prejudice. Men who are known as experts in what is called the "Higher Criticism" of the scriptures, should be gracious enough always to remember that there are at least some intelligent non-experts who are capable of some discrimination in forming a judgment, and that such are liable to revolt against a critical dogmatism that is not based upon sufficient grounds, and who decline to be enslaved by the opinions of a self constituted court of critical arbiters, and especially when the court shows such a pronounced capacity for self-reversal. Such men are not seeking to ignore a single issue raised by "Mod-

ern scholarship," even if they are disposed to pay little attention to the horde of Bible-haters who sneak up under cover of other men's attacks and play the part of Bashibazouks in a campaign they are incompetent to originate. Such men too are made cautious when they have seen one hypothesis after another surrendered by experts and non-experts, with the exception of the obstinate few with whom it is likely that an hypothesis once stated is stronger than a real principle, or a position taken more important than a carefully ascertained and indisputable fact.

We stand in this discussion for the rights of the general scholar, for ordinarily well-informed men who are classified as "non-experts," and who are somewhat arrogantly set outside the walls by those who call themselves "experts." Critics in their assumption of a monopoly of knowledge on the subjects of their investigation have no right to assume that those who do not humbly and modestly agree with them have been smitten with blindness and mental stagnation. Every such assumption is certain to arouse the assertion of the principle of that individual right that is fundamental, and an assertion of it that may in some cases even lead to its exaggeration.

What should be properly designated the "destructive critics," whose work in recent years has been so persistently and ostentatiously pressed upon the attention of the Church and the world, include two classes: those who are destructive and avow it and those who are destructive and vehemently affirm that they are constructive. Those of the former class are usually bold to the point of audacity, and in the affirmation of their hypotheses have the ex-cathadra air of the papist. They have as much faith in their own theories as would be needed to accept the beliefs of the most superstitious of religions that have ever been declared among men. The destructive critics who affirm that they are constructive are not so bold in expression but are often fully as presumptuous and self-confident as the others. Both have the same air of cock-sureness and both as confidently affirm that the man who is not a critical specialist has no right, even to an opinion, expressed with any confidence, on matters pertaining to their field of specialization.

We have read some of the books of the Higher Critics of the destructive order, and some of those written by the constructives who have opposed and corrected them. We have also observed

from time to time the changing attitude of many of the former, and have further been interested to note how many of both old and young, anxious no doubt to be counted among the up-to-date experts, have in turn made readjustments and fallen into line with certain of the leaders, and then again, how that when the leaders of the destructive school have been obliged to correct themselves and acknowledge their errors,—a thing for which they have actually shown capacity—their followers immediately, in turn, readjusted themselves and were as confident as ever that they were once more in the succession of duly accredited “experts.” Personally the writer has the feeling that he would be just as willing and that it would be just as reasonable to submit the direction of his mind and his faith to the Pope, the head of a great and venerable hierarchy reaching back to the times of Leo the Great and Gregory the Great, as to submit either or both to a syndicate of self-appreciating, mutual admiration critical experts. This can be said of the Pope who dwells by the Tiber, that while his pretensions have no basis in either Scripture or history, he does not change his own administration as frequently as the critical popes have been known to change their hypotheses. When one knows that an order or a theory possesses the attribute of stability and is not subject to such rapid modifications he can at least adjust himself with some assurance of mental tranquility.

In the Church of Rome, as is well known, the organ of administration is the hierarchy. Its judgments are presumed to be infallibly correct and from them the devout and faithful are never supposed to appeal, however much their understanding and conscience may be outraged. When moral independence exists it has come to pass not in consequence of the Church’s training, but in spite of it. In the hierarchy common men are looked upon as the passive recipients of blessing, while the favored or the clergy, are the active Church, leading, instructing, interceding for and governing the first class named. The Church is authoritative, the sacraments are the channels of salvation and the priest is necessary to make the sacraments valid. Our time in the Church has seen the rise of a new sort of hierarchy which has some marked features in common with that older one just described. The new at least assumes, even if many qualified and competent men dissent, the attribute of infallibility in its own

sphere. This new hierarchy is composed of many of the advanced biblical critics of the day, particularly such as display the usual condescension and ex-cathedra imperiousness of their class. In much that is said and written in our day on critical subjects pertaining to the sacred Scriptures, there is an implication that the "expert" scholars of the Church, the trained-abroad "specialists" contribute a new sort of supreme court through which final judgments are pronounced on mooted questions. The authority of the Pope and cardinals being rejected as the final interpreters of Schistianity, and the authority of the Scriptures being weakened in our time in many Protestant minds, there has emerged a tendency to set up another authority to be known as the "unanimous verdict of scholars" and the "consensus" of the experts. These men pronounce such supposed infallible judgments in the sphere of alleged critical scholarship that it is with some temerity that an ordinary man who still holds fast to some old fashioned views about the Bible arises to express his dissent from certain unwarrantable assumptions proclaimed over and over again. Because he cannot attain to such attenuated heights of hypercritical speculation as have been attained by some of the critical hierarchs, and because he is unwilling to accept as "results" what seems to him upon the basis of duly accredited data, to rest chiefly upon the imagination of the writers, this ordinary man is sometimes even called hard names and placed without the camp as an obsolete and out-of-date ignoramus. He is set aside, to use the words of one of the most advanced representatives of the critical hierarchy as "a theological bourbon who never learns anything from past defeats." He is further assured that he has no right to opinions upon questions of scholarship pertaining to the Bible unless he has become an "expert." It is very frankly assumed that the Church must go to the "experts" to find out what the Bible really is. Not long ago for instance, a representative writer of this school averred that "the real conflict is now between modern scholarship and the traditional view." And again, that "it is a battle of truth against prejudice," and further we are confidently assured that now "practically all Old Testament scholars" have accepted what is known as the Wellhausen theory and any attempt at dissent from this judgment is arrogantly stigmatized as "the protest of theological prejudice against the application to the Bible study of

modern methods of linguistic, historical, archaeological and literary investigation."

To the ordinary man who is reasonably well informed only on the subject it may look strange that such of the new hierarchy as pass as the champions of independent thought, and who seem to think that they have been called and anointed to break the chains of authority imposed by the hierachial Church of the past, should be so constantly and confidently appealing to the authority of "all scholars," and the "consensus of modern scholarship"—which by the way is no consensus at all—to settle in the most authoritative manner vital questions affecting our estimate of the Holy Scriptures.

A very meagre induction into the facts in the case, we are assured, will make it amply apparent that if there is any dogmatic assertiveness that can surpass that which is a characteristic of some members of the new critical school when they speak of their work as being "exact and thorough in its methods" and of the theory that "Moses did not write the pentateuch" and that "Isaiah did not write half of the book that bears his name," and of "the sure acceptance of their views by all genuine scholars the world over," then we are not acquainted with that form of confident assertiveness. Now it is not pleasant for the ordinary man who still has some cherished and sturdy beliefs about the Bible to be assured in this confident fashion that he is trying to smash the "microscope of criticism" and that he is still wearing the "spectacles of a vanquished tradition." It is not agreeable to him to be driven from the field by loudly sounding deprecations and not to be misunderstood intimations that he is not even qualified to hold an opinion. It moves him to sorrow when he sees his Bible surrendered as a corpse is given over to the anatomist for ruthless dissection. But being entirely capable of detecting the weak point in the "expert's" harness and able to see the weakness of a great many alleged proofs, it stirs his resentment when the effort is made to force upon him some sophisticated hypothesis, destructive of his most cherished and valuable beliefs, and which is to be blindly accepted even before it has been subjected to a candid and unbiased investigation. Such a man is disinclined to be cudgeled out of court because it has come with him to be a serious question not merely whether a doctrine is grounded on the Scriptures, but whether the Scriptures them-

selves, the sacred collection of writings to which the truly Protestant theology and Church make their final appeal is worthy of reception as the final arbiter and test of truth in the important sphere of religion. He does not graciously submit to being placed in the class of incompetents because he cannot see the wisdom in the assumption that what is old and established is necessarily at variance with the canons of sound scholarship.

The man who still has the conviction that the Bible is the veritable word of God, having divine inspiration and authority, is not going to submit without a struggle, and be frightened from the field by that kind of biblical criticism which comes with a long list of preconceptions, opinions and guesses which form the basis of theories which in themselves have no foundation, and which become in turn the basis of other theories, often diverse from one another, and often resting on nothing but an original unprovable guess.

That we have not presented an exaggerated aspect of the attitude of a class of critics, is manifest enough in what many of them have said. "There may be such a thing as the slavery of traditionalism, but evidences multiply that there is also the slavery of criticism." Take a sentence like this from Beyschlag, who says of I. Timothy: "The man who is now able to ascribe it to the author of the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians has never comprehended the literary peculiarity and greatness of the apostle." Herein is a fine bit of scorn for all those who do not agree with Beyschlag. It is an expression of critical popery and comes to this if you wish to rank as critic or scholar agree with me.

As a confirmation of this judgment it is interesting to note what is said by Prof. Nash of the Cambridge Divinity School in his "History of the Higher Criticism," a book that ably advocates the right of criticism as a science. Prof. Nash affirms:

"There has existed these past sixty years, a party of critics who have borne themselves as if there were some such thing as a purely critical process, and as if they were its representatives. In truth, there is no such thing as an absolutely pure critical process. And the idolatrous estimate of the imaginary standard of criticism is just another chapter in the long history of the reign of words, another divorce between words and things... The critics are part of a great stream of interest and prejudice and

passion.... The story of the purely dispassioned critic is another edition of Robinson Crueso.... If the conceit of a purely critical process be kept up, it creates a new kind of orthodoxy.... They put outside the critical pale those who retain any part of the supernatural interpretation of the origins of Christianity.... But, surely, it is at least conceivable that a mind strongly conservative might be more truly critical than the most radical critic, might have a holier desire to get at the whole body of facts recorded in the Scriptures."

These are fine words and as aptly spoken as they are timely. In his "Historical New Testament" Dr. James Moffatt is full of the same sort of radical and supercilious scorn toward all conservatives. In a late number of a review, Principal Salmond speaks of a certain style of criticism with a severity so unlike himself that it is impossible not to be startled by it. The subject under discussion was one of the volumes of Cheyne's "Encyclopedia Biblica," and his anger is specially aroused by Schmeidel's article on the Gospels, though he is not indeed the only one of the writers of the encyclopedia whom he condemns. The learned principal is provoked at "the lack of reverence, the arbitrary pretensions, self-confident subjectivity, that intrude themselves in so many contributions to the volume." But with Schmeidel he is out of all patience, because as he thinks, in his case, we have a method of dealing with the New Testament narratives, which if applied to Tacitus or Gibbon would make their histories absolutely ridiculous. Schmeidel starts with the presupposition that Christ was a mere man and a man only, and accepts as historically reliable only such passages in the Gospels which would seem to imply his humanity,—such for example, as "Why callest thou me good," "Of that day knoweth no one not the Son." "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me." "The numerous passages," says Dr. Salmond, "which speak of a unique relation of Christ to God are hidden out of sight by the wave of the hand," while "the origin of most of the miraculous narratives is to be sought in figurative speech." This method of dealing with the Gospels it may be said has been smitten with absurdity and may be described as biblical criticism gone mad. But it is worth remembering that it does not differ essentially from the method employed by men of more

sober spirit than Schmeidel, and the conclusions of which are just as objectionable.

The language used by Dr. Lyman Abbott to express his view of the book of Jonah is by another writer pronounced to be so much akin to that of Thomas Paine, that he is led to wonder whether it is a case of remarkable coincidence or a case of teacher and pupil. He presents the two views in parallel columns that the striking similarity may be seen the more readily.

## LYMAN ABBOTT.

## THOMAS PAINÉ.

"The Book of Jonah " * * * was written as that it has been written as a a piece of satirical fiction, to fable to expose the nonsense satirize the narrowness of cer- and satirize the vicious and tain Jewish prophets."	"It is more probable * * * and malignant character of a Bible prophet or a malignant priest."
---	---

The striking similarity forces us to the conclusion that Mr. Thomas Paine so accurately anticipated not only the views, but the expression of these views, by the able editor of the *Outlook* who was to come one hundred years after him, as to at least lay the foundation for one of the most remarkable coincidences on record. Certainly Principal Salmon was right in view of all this and much more that might be cited, in declaring "self-confident subjectivity" to be one of the conspicuous facts in the work of the modern hierarchy of destructive critics.

It may not be out of place here to quote Dr. Robertson Nicoll editor of the *Expositor*, as applicable to the cool assumption and confident certainty of such critical popularizers as Kent, Sanders and others, that all the truth is completely and finally with themselves. He says:

"Bishop Lightfoot, who is practically ignored by the new critics, but who surpassed them as much in knowledge as he did in judgment, expressed in memorable words his opinion of many German critics. He compared their work to that of the Rabbis of Jewish exegesis. The Rabbis were quite as able, quite as learned, but their work came to nought, even as the work of the many German critics, though minute and searching, failed because it was conceived in a false vein. It may be, said Light-

foot, that "the historical sense of seventeen or eighteen centuries is larger and truer than the critical insight of a section of men in our late half century."

It is enough to say that conservatives are not going to be frightened by pretentious assumptions and scornful flings. They are not as noisy as the radicals and do not get as much free advertising in the papers as "great and free scholars," but they are just as sincere; they know where they stand and why, and are not lacking in scholarship, sense or numbers. They are not to be terrified longer by the alleged and mythical "consensus of opinion." Facts about the holy Scriptures are not to be settled by a majority vote of either the populace or of scholars. Holtzmann once called Weiss "dogmatic" and not "scientific," because Weiss differed from him. Prof. Nash well says: "It requires a considerable dash of infallibility to draw the "scientific line across the field of New Testament study in that fashion," to which we may add that infallibility is an alleged attribute of but one man—the head of the papal system who abides in seclusion in the vatican at Rome. It seems strange that logical processes which would not be tolerated in any natural or moral science are received with a respect akin to awe when advanced to support the wildest assertion connected with the Bible, and the first years of the history of the Christian Church, and that historical methods that would make a man the laughing stock of the learned world if applied to the history of Germany in the Middle Ages, or to North America in the colonial period are still applied to biblical subjects with an assurance that they will be accepted and seriously discussed. Face to face with the modern conception of the world we have what we call the "new science." Along with it there has come a new learning applied to the Scriptures. That new learning must not expect to command respect and win a place of permanent recognition by opposing the commonly received teaching of the Christian Church with the methods of that old hierarchy whose claims are disallowed by the most enlightened portion of Christendom. Devout men and fairly informed men are likely to go on refusing to listen to a self-constituted court of authority which seeks to improve the lame logic and the suspicious hypotheses of many of the critics of the last two hundred years as something more worthy of seri-

ous consideration than the Bible as a unity in God's providential dealing with His people.

But what we have thus far said is in no way intended to discredit the function and the usefulness of legitimate criticism. There is criticism and criticism. There is textual criticism and literary criticism also called the "Higher Criticism." Textual criticism is a science and of unspeakable value in the proper study of God's Word. Higher criticism is again of two kinds—destructive and constructive. Neither division is new. Constructive criticism has been carried on for generations, frequently under the name of biblical introduction. The destructive criticism is also old, but it has received special emphasis during the past one hundred years. There is a sane and sober criticism of the "higher" order. Its attitude is that which is strictly judicial and not based upon presuppositions and subjectivism. This is that which is in the best sense critical. The Bible has two sides, one human and the other divine. We are to take hold of its divine side, and view the book in its unity, as the one unchangeable word of God, the pledge of our Father's love and His gracious purposes with us, the expression of the divine will in man's redemption, the living witness of what God has been to our fathers and what He is to us in Christ Jesus. Luther took hold on that divine side as every Christian must take hold upon it if his faith is to have a strong and secure basis. But the Bible also has its human, external and historical side, and upon that Luther also took hold. In that aspect it appears as a collection of writings made at various times, from various authors and in various styles, based upon various historical relations and circumstances, all of which must be studied if we would understand and interpret the sacred oracles aright. The right of the higher critics to pursue his work in his own sphere is not questioned. What is objected to is the conduct of that criticism in such a manner as to present us as its outcome, with a new and reduced Christianity documented in a new and reduced body of Scriptures. Dogmatic presuppositions are not to be read into the biblical narratives, and no more is matter to be read out of those narratives on the score of dogmatic presuppositions, such as the non-occurrence of divine interventions in human history. Christianity asks for no franking privileges. It does not ask exemption from candid investigation. It is but fair to ask the

miraculous, for example, to give a good and satisfactory account of itself, and to submit its claims to fair tests of credibility. But to exclude it by a sweeping speculative dictum, as is done by some of the critical hierarchy, is not scientific and in no wise savors of the much exploited "historical method." That is sheer dogmatism instead of legitimate criticism.

This destructive criticism proceeds for the most part from certain chairs in great universities, the occupants of which are not necessarily ministers nor even Christians. They are simply scholars learned in languages. It is likely that their position exposes them to peculiar temptations. They see their fellow professors in the departments of the physical sciences constantly making discoveries and gaining honor for what is called "original research." They likely want to be abreast of chemists, electricians and other physicists and share with them in popular recognition. Work that is regular, faithful and efficient is not usually the kind that creates a sensation or elicits the newspaper crown. As Dr. George H. Schodde says there is, among German university scholars practically, "a canon that recognition as scholars can be based only upon the discovery of something new. A compiler or mere polyhistor is not a scholar, according to German ideals. Only he is such that produces 'new' results. The temptation to offer these at all hazards is, naturally, only too great. As a rule, these advanced theologies are based on a germ of truth, the exaggerations and abuse of which constitute their 'stock in trade.'"

If we might be permitted to add to Dr. Schodde's unquestionably correct statement, it would be to say that even the "germ" is often lacking, and that the new thing is put forth without even so much for a basis, and buttressed by a great show of learning, to the amazement and grief of careful seekers after truth and to the delight of unbelievers.

We have no just reason to fear biblical criticism when it is genuinely scientific, when it is governed by principles that are applicable to its subject matter, and when it does not substitute precarious and rationalistic conjectures for established facts. Criticism where rightly ordered, is nothing more than careful examination and testing, having for its aim the verification of truth and the exclusion of error. If proper implements are employed and properly employed, the application of criticism to

the Scriptures ought to be welcomed, for it creates a more accurate knowledge of the most important of all subjects. The Church in our age is not afraid of the discovery of truth, the revelations of science, the progress of knowledge or the march of mankind to higher standpoints and clearer views. It has been the chief promoter of all of them. It is not to be charged with obscurantism because not willing to accept views which are still in the speculative age. It is not to be accused of cowardice because of its unwillingness to accept some theory about the Bible that may not live to see its first anniversary. There must be something very real in a discovery to justify it in appealing to the courage of conviction in such an important matter as religion. There is no cowardice in declining to attempt a landing in some hypothetical fog bank or in the refusal to line up with some vanquished heresy for a mere truth. It is not correct to put a man up in the category of great scholars simply because he has advanced something new and startling. There is such a thing, even in our day of startling announcements, as a man bringing to the investigation of theological problems and biblical questions a ripe and ample scholarship and yet see no serious reason for a change of his most cherished beliefs. To say that he is no "expert" in scholarship simply because he reaches such a conclusion is a preposterous begging of the question. The fears of devout and good men who love the Bible are not to be quieted nor the theories of critics who have been swept off their feet by the cry of progress confirmed by an obvious assumption of infallibility.

It is no doubt true that some of the traditional views regarding the Scriptures are incorrect in particulars and when the higher critics succeed in bringing the truth to light it is our duty to accept their results without hesitation however unexpected they may be. But it is not logical to surrender old views concerning the dates and sources of sacred literature before we have assured ourselves that the new conclusions maintained by the critics have been arrived at by methods that are really scientific and historical and are supported by sufficient evidence to warrant them to the classification of final results. Anxiety to get into line at the very earliest possible moment with the views of specialists does not proceed from reason or intelligent regard for evidence so much as it is frequently the outcome of excessive

ference to very precarious authority. Plausibilities do not afford sufficient reason for a revolution of accepted opinions, especially if, as in the case of biblical criticism, there is reason to suspect the validity of the point of view which creates the plausibility. It may even be seriously contended, when one confronts the surrenders and modifications made by its own representatives, in the memory of men yet under fifty, whether much of the higher criticism is entitled to be worthy of the name of a science, for many of its conclusions have destroyed themselves. Their own authors come speedily to the point of their rejection. That which is ever changing cannot be true and is hardly scientific. Much of this work has been impulsive and subjective. It has seemed to esteem evidence of much less importance than the subjective consciousness.

The radical defect of the kind of criticism we seek to antagonize, as it seems to us, is this—the fundamental principle of its working theory seems to be the reconstruction of the Bible on a purely naturalistic basis. The distinction between the natural and the supernatural must be abolished. All history must be accounted for by a natural development. Though we may speak of a divine plan in history this must be taken loosely and by way of accommodation to human thought. Many things must be spoken in this way and are, in fact, put thus both in the Scriptures and out of the Scriptures. On the contrary this presupposition must be present in a truly Christian and scientific Old Testament criticism, so much pursued in our day that the Bible is the Word of God throughout and supernaturally inspired. The writer does not now refer to any particular theory concerning the method of this inspiration, or how it became the Word of God. But this doctrine, this fundamental concept, that the Scriptures are divinely inspired is no cryptic nonsense lying out beyond the boundaries of intelligible definition. It means something very definite. It means in the language of one of the ancient creeds that the Holy Ghost somehow “spake by the prophets.” In a very real and proper sense that can be said of no other form of literature ancient or modern. God is the author of the sacred Scriptures. Not that the human agency in its authorship has been entirely nullified, but that we may say of every part of the Bible as of no other book, that God as well as man had to do with the making of it what it is. And such a

literature thus produced is certain to exhibit some literary peculiarities, which theories as to its human source or sources will not and cannot fully explain.

The outcome of the criticism that proceeds on any other and naturalistic assumption makes sad work of the Bible. What it comes to has been well described by one of our own most capable scholars, Dr. Theodore Schmauk, in a review of a book written by an advanced representative of this critical hierarchy. The Bible, says he, under such treatment, "degenerates into a heap of soluble but unimpressive literary remains. The old Books of the Bible are entirely dissolved, and the basis of arrangement is that of traced literary similarities in the hypothetical Biblical traditions and documents that went into the make-up of the present Bible. The book is much as if you would tear Westminster Abbey to pieces, and assort the parts into stone piles, brick piles, lumber piles, mortar and plaster piles, etc. This, in the author's mind, is wherein the logical superiority of his work consists, and he would say: 'Now, behold the glories of Westminster Abbey: Here are the older, and there are the newer dust and stone heaps. We have carefully broken all statues to pieces, and separated the original parts of lines hewn and casts made, from those found by us to be later. Here is Westminster arranged according to a true critical logic.'"

In view of all now that may be adduced in the name of sound learning and genuine religion it is not surprising that men of fair attainments and interest in the life, work and future of the Church should be disinclined to accept with confidence and as authoritative the products of the ingenious fancy of this new critical hierarchy as over against the sober tradition and teaching of the years of the life of the spirit guided Church. The reasons that may be adduced are numerous, serious and well-authenticated.

1. First of all there is the harm that has been done. It would be difficult to estimate the damage that has been done in the last forty years, to the legitimate authority of the Bible, not by faithful criticism, but by the flippant language and the destructive spirit of leading critics. When we consider that a biblical encyclopedia edited by a divinity professor of the Church of England proceeds systematically upon the supposition that nothing in the Bible is to be believed unless it is corroborated by

other evidence, it would be difficult to imagine anything more destructive of what was once supposed to be the sole foundation of the Christian faith. And who can deny that the destructive work of this critical hierarchy we have thus discussed, has had a baneful influence on the minds of thousands of ministers and hundreds of thousands of lay people who have no knowledge of scientific criticism, but who have been left wandering in dry places on the popular assumption that in our day, nothing is settled in religion, and that even leaders in the Church have at last been forced to abandon the old paths. The gravity of the matter is strongly presented by Professor Robins, the author of "The Ethics of the Christian Life," in what he says under the heading of "The Attempt to Dislodge the Bible:" In such attempts says this able Baptist scholar, we have "an ominous sign of our times, namely, the attempt to dislodge the Bible from its unique place in the literature and history of the world, and, loosen its hold upon the affections of the people by a method of so-called criticism which *in its extreme form leaves* little that is of historic value in its records and deprives it of its spiritual usefulness. If these extremists have their way unopposed and attain their end the Bible will no longer be what it always has been, the 'supreme rule of faith and practice' of believers in Christ."

2. Another feature in the methods of this critical hierarchy to discredit its work, is the fact that it sweeps a large part of the Old Testament, in particular, into the rubbish heap of legend and myth with unconcealed disdain. It is difficult to express the audacity of this modern criticism. Professor Cheyne, in an article entitled "A Turning Point in Old Testament Study," has called attention to the conclusions of Hugo Winckler, a learned German whom he praises very highly, and who has to the satisfaction of Professor Winckler, and it would seem also to the satisfaction of Professor Cheyne, resolved all of the Old Testament heroes even down to King Solomon into solar and lunar myths. Abraham instead of being the living, journeying, struggling, believing and sometimes sinning man that he has for centuries been regarded, has become an "eponym" of Abraham. That word may roll well from the tongue and look well in rhetorical expression, but it is ambiguous and hazy and has a perplexing significance. Isaac and Jacob are lunar heroes and the twelve tribes of Israel the twelve signs of the zodiac.

Jacob was the moon, Joseph the sun and so on down to Solomon who is a mythical and not an historical figure of any kind. David is a constellation, and Giant Goliath none other than Orion. Thus the patriarchs of the Hebrew nation, and David "the sweet singer of Israel," fade away into the ghostly dreams of a credulous age. The human intellect, we are told, cannot be bound by the significance of certain words. Accordingly instead of revealed truth as to creation and the first man and his fall into sin, we have the "legends of Genesis." We are assured that we know nothing and can know nothing of the origin of the universe. The Garden of Eden, man's primal holiness in the moral image of God, his moral fall, these are mere imaginations, hypotheses invented to account for existing facts and not veritable explanations. Most of them were borrowed from ancient sources and other peoples. "Who believes now," we are exultantly asked, "that Adam and Eve were historical characters?" As to the story of the fall into sin, we are assured that "nobody knows that a single word of it is true, and so far as the statement comes within the range of modern knowledge every word of it is false," and again the question is asked, "Who does not know that Satan is really a fiction of the ancient imagination, as really as Baal or Jupiter."

Years ago a ribald but popular infidel lecturer went up and down this land lecturing, at big remuneration, about "The Mistakes of Moses," when now indeed some of the more radical among the critics consider the chief mistake of Moses the thought that the most commanding figure in Jewish history ever lived at all. Rameses II would have found some of the critics valuable when he was trying to suppress the Hebrews in Egypt for some of them deny that they were ever in the land of Rameses.

And it is interesting to note how the ground of attack has gradually shifted. Fifty years ago the local point of the battle was the Fourth Gospel and the person of our Lord revealed in that Gospel. Then the Old Testament had its turn, and now as Dr. Robertson Nicoll phrases it, "the storm has moved round the whole horizon, but it is rapidly concentrating its strength and fury above one sacred head." The latest criticism now being much popularized in this country does not longer evade the real issue, to which it all must at last come; its aim is admittedly to obliterate Jesus Christ as the Son of God, and the Son of Man

from history. It is at this point we feel assured that the whole Church will gladly accept battle and contend with absolute confidence. More than thirty years ago the distinguished English Independent, the late Dr. R. W. Dale, said in an address at the Congregational Union, the question of the veracity of the Bible must in the end become the question of the authority of Christ. Readers of the last volume of the *Encyclopedia Biblica*, edited by Dr. Cheyne; and those who have read "The Historical New Testament" of Moffatt, and the "New Epoch of Faith" by Dr. George Gordon, can hardly longer doubt that the Christianity presented in such writings is a Christianity resting upon man and not upon Christ. The positions taken in these works, by men who still claim to be Christian teachers, is not simply the rejection of the Old Testament but the rejection of the New, and the dethronement of our Lord from his unique place as the Son of God and the authoritative Teacher and Redeemer of mankind. It is now confidently and audaciously maintained that we have no supernatural revelation in Jesus Christ and that the "time has come when the churches and the theologians must decide whether religious truth is to be sought, as all truth is, and its authority be what all truth possesses, or whether it is to be received as a gift to which nothing can be added, and for which nothing can be substituted." We are thus summoned in the name of "modern scholarship" to abandon as untenable the conviction of the Christian Church, held during all the Christian centuries, that we have given us in the sacred Scriptures a special revelation of the way of salvation for sinful men through Jesus Christ.

We accordingly repeat that it is not surprising that men dissent from this new hierarchy of destructives; that they refuse to accept its judgment as infallible when it employs methods of criticism of the Old Testament which when transferred to the New, demolish at a stroke the structures of historical Christianity, resolve the incarnation by the virgin birth into a fable, the deity of our Lord into a myth, an aftergrowth of the imagination of his too credulous disciples, His resurrection from the dead a mere translation of the fact of His death into an objective rising of His dead body, His ascension to heaven as the vision of an overheated brain and His session at the right hand of the Father where He ever liveth to make intercession for us as noth-

ing more than a perpetuation among men of the tradition of His example.. What the critics have yielded as indefensible aspects of our holy religion have at last proven to be the citadel itself. We know the Christ which the infallible Scriptures give us, and every lineament of that divine form is precious to the devout believer. But how much of it goes down in the wreckage wrought by the destructive critics? Which Christ shall we be ultimately forced to put up with? the Christ that Wernle gives us? or Werde? or Oscar Holtzmann? or August Sabatier? or Bossuet? the Christ whom Prof. Drews has entirely eliminated? or the Christ of the Gospels and Epistles of the divinely inspired New Testament? The non-expert has the logical, philological, philosophical and moral right to say within himself and to others, that whether or not he thinks himself competent to overthrow the details of the process and even to follow it, he will accept no theory which leads in the direction of such dark disaster to the world's most precious interests, even though a procession of "experts" of ever increasing length and arrogance affirm that theory. In the Smalkald Articles the Lutheran Church says, "For it is of no consequence that articles of faith are framed from the works or words of the holy fathers." In the Formula of Concord it is said, "We believe, teach and confess that the only rule and standard according to which at once all dogmas and teachers should be esteemed and judged are nothing else than the prophetic Scriptures of the Old and of the New Testaments." The symbols of the Reformed Church teach the same doctrine. This excludes all unwritten traditions not only but also all decrees of the visible Church; all resolutions of conventions or other bodies, declaring this or that to be right or wrong, true or false. The people of God are bound by nothing but the Word of God. But what becomes of this binding authority of the Word of God, if fancy and fact, fraud, misapprehension and misrepresentation are so intertwined and wrought into the entire text of the Bible, that the uninstructed reader is left in hopeless despair of ever finding anything that is settled and any bit of solid ground upon which to rest in confidence and assurance?

3. Another fact that induces distrust of this critical hierarchy under discussion, and its methods is the dubious character of its "assured results." Of course if the results of this line of work are really assured, we must accept them, and must change

our views of the Bible, however reluctant to do so we may be and however great the moral and spiritual desolation which may result. Our religion and our morals must not rest upon a lie. But the question is as to the assurance of these widely heralded "assured results." They are not for the most part assured at all. When they have not been utterly discredited they have been rendered decidedly dubious. It is always to be remembered that much of the work of this critical school is of a very transient nature. They make extensive claims of "settled results" but such results are hard to find. Their theories may be brilliant and startling but they are unsubstantial. Prof. Sellin writing of the Wellhausen theory admits that "we stand in a time of fermentation and transition," and he presents his "own opinion merely as the hypothesis that seems to us to be best founded." Prof. Henry Preserved Smith, one of the chieftains in the critical hierarchy, has recently said: "Each year we have the necessity forced upon us to learn something new and to unlearn something of the things we had supposed settled." It is not so long since the death of Dr. Robertson Smith, and yet his admiring disciple, Prof. Kennett, in re-editing Smith's article on the "Book of Psalms" for a new edition of the "Encyclopedia Britannica," says that he has had "to omit or rewrite" much of it and of his, Smith's, contention as to the date of the writing of many of the Psalms, that "the theory is untenable" owing to the results of Old Testament study since Prof. Smith's day. Pretentious commentaries by this school are scarcely issued until they are in need of revision. Some of them, for a good part at least, are already about as valuable as last year's birds' nests. A prominent writer of this school asserted before a company of theological students, with a triumphant air, that the battle between criticism and traditionalism was finished in favor of criticism, and that all that now remained was to fix the indemnity. One of his contentions was that the date of the ceremonial law was later than the captivity. In a short time after making the above declaration, the same writer was candid enough to announce that the date of the ceremonial law could not be placed later than 1350, B. C., which certainly comes so near to the traditional date that the difference warrants no notice.

Not many years ago writers of the Wellhausen school were certain about the mistake in the date of Mosaic authorship of the

Pentateuch because the age of the Hebrew language was not a literary age. The art of writing could not have been in use among the Hebrews of that period. Vatka, who was regarded by Wellhausen as an authority on that subject, denied that Moses had any knowledge of writing. Wellhausen himself took the same view for he says in his article on "Israel" in the "Encyclopedia Britannica," "Writing had been practiced earlier than 850-750 B. C.; but only on formal instruments mainly on stone." But now we have the discovery of Amarna Tablets of Abraham's age and of the code of Hammurabi centuries older than Moses and more recently the discovery of the Elephantine Papyri scarcely later than the time of Ezra. It is now a demonstrable fact that in the century before the exodus Palestine was a land of books and schools. Thus one of the "assured results" of the critics was completely overturned, which serves us as an admonition not to accept too promptly the conclusions of the critics. They do not have even as much claim to infallibility as the pope, and his claims are beset with difficulties that make them preposterous. The critics, too, in order, let us say, to construct a theory of the development of religion in Israel, assume as a fundamental that all religions begin in fetishism, or some similar low form, and then gradually develop into monotheism. But how does he know that all religions begin then on a low plane and rise to monotheism? He does not know it, nor does he undertake to prove it, but only assumes it. No idolatrous or polytheistic or fetish religion has ever so developed, no natural religion to use a generic term—has ever become monotheistic. In every such religion the tendency has been downward to grosser polytheism and idolatry. The farther back we go in the examination of the origin of religions in India and Egypt, or any other countries where early records are open to us the simpler and purer is the faith. Polytheists and idolaters, it is true have become Monotheists, but not however by development of their own, but by conversion to some other religion. The only monotheistic religions in the world are Christianity, Judaism and Mohammedanism, and these were monotheistic in their origin. There are no examples of the development out of polytheism into a higher faith. To use the words of Prof. Kittel of Leipzig, "Science also is tending toward the assumption that Polytheism, and still cruder forms of heathenism, were not original,

but represent degenerate phases of an originally higher conception of God." The lower forms of religion, according to this great scholar, are to be regarded as the results of a process of degeneration. The unity of God is and remains the distinctive inheritance of Israel.

Another of the assumptions of this school is this, that "modern scholarship" has "proved" that underlying the Pentateuch and constituting its basis are two independent documents which the "critics" indicate by the symbols J. and E. and that these documents were woven together by an editor or "redactor" who is indicated by R. But even this J. P. and E. and R., &c., of the Driver notions have never been established and on this subject the critics have been divided into warring schools. A man who speaks of this theory as a "proved fact" speaks either from inordinate prejudice or from a total misapprehension of what constitutes proof. It is another case where guesses have been taken for facts and theories for evidence.

In an article in the "Bibliotheca Sacra" for January 1908, the Hon. Mr. Lamb, a jurist of distinction, who knows what facts and proof are, uses this language regarding this fantastic analytical theory. "What evidence do the higher critics produce to prove that the alleged E and J narratives existed before the Pentateuch was written or existed? None. What these critics propose as evidence to prove their affirmations true is found in their abundant publications. They do not even pretend to produce any direct or positive evidence to maintain that allegation." This is the judgment of an eminent lawyer whose profession has disciplined him in the science of weighing facts and sifting evidence, and after carefully examining the evidence which the "critics" bring forward to establish their proposition, he unhesitatingly declares their proof to be worthless.

For a time it will, we are sure, be remembered by some of our readers, Prof. Harnack held to the theory of the composite authorship of the book of Acts. But later this great scholar presented an elaborate and convincing study to show that this important book in the canon of the New Testament "The we passages and all were written by the beloved physician, Luke. More recently he has asserted that many of the critical positions must be given up and a closer adhesion to the conservative and traditional position be maintained.

Too much of the reasoning of this school is contradictory. Speaking of the prophets of the Old Testament one of these writers tells us in one place that "the predictors were chosen without regard to their moral attainment" and in another "the first great and permanent service that the Old Testament renders to a man is that it presents to him personalities worthy of the profoundest reverence." Again we are informed in one paragraph that "in turning from the Old Testament to the New we are turning to a new religion" while in the paragraph following we are told also "that it is hard to prove that Jesus introduced any absolutely new religious conception." In this aspect of the subject there is abundant reason why people, both learned and unlearned, are slow to share in the confidence with which the new critical hierarchy is attempting to force its conclusions upon the Church and the world as though they were all based upon indisputable data and infallible logic, upon the basis of mere hypotheses, mere guesses and plausible conjecture, people are asked to surrender the most potent religious beliefs that the world has known. And this is called the latest and soundest "assured result" of the new critical method. In its last analysis the radical features of this movement come to a denial of revelation, a repudiation of the supernatural, a reduction of all religion, to a human evolution, originating in man, never going beyond man and knowing nothing but man.

4. The theories and much of the work of the hierarchy under consideration too meets with a severe repulse at the hands of thoroughly accredited scholars in this department of learning. If any one doubts this let him read any good statement of the radical critical methods, as for example Wellhausen's "Prolegomena," which has been translated, and then read Professor Orr's "The Problem of the Old Testament," and then ask himself without prejudice how much of the former remains. The refutation is overwhelming. In his day Professor William Henry Green of Princeton, was likely at the head of the Old Testament scholarship of this country, and his great work on "The Unity of the Book of Genesis," digs the analytical theory, the composite J E and R assumption, up by the roots and shows conclusively that Genesis was practically written by one and the same hand. No serious effort has been made to answer Professor Green's great book and as a scholarly and conclusive refutation of de-

structive theories, it yet holds the field. The fact that in whole lists of works published on this subject, such books as this of Professor Green and others of the same order are entirely omitted, furnishes a species of unqualified dogmatism that is a fine travesty on the "open-mindedness" so much exploited among members of the critical hierarchy.

The claim of this kind of critics that the real scholars in Germany, England and our country hold to the destructive critical positions reminds us of the reply once made by one of the sanest scholars of his day in this country to a friend of the advanced school. The latter had made an address in which he claimed that "all first-class scholars agreed with him." To this the former replied with a story. A man manufactured a patent baking powder and advertised it widely as kept by "all first-class grocers." When asked who were the first-class grocers, he answered promptly, "only those who keep my baking powder." The critical unworthiness of much of the work done in our generation in this department of learning has been set forth time and again by men whose names carry great weight. Professor Ramsay, for instance, the author of "St. Paul the Traveler and the Roman Citizen," declares in the preface to that work, "There is no class of literary product in our century (the nineteenth) in which there is such an enormous preponderance of error and bad judgment as in that of historical criticism." The late Bishop Lightfoot, referring to the German "Higher Criticism," said that nowhere in any literature, did he know of such a mass of absurdities as has been heaped together by some of the most able and learned German critics in connection with the names Euodias and Syntyche in the "Epistle to the Philippians." Professor Sayee of Oxford, having averred that the end of the nineteenth century was "witnessing the ebb of a wave of historical criticism which began to flow more than a century ago," delivered the following judgment on the general question: "The higher critic may be right in holding that the historical books of the Old Testament in their present form are compilations of late date, but he is no longer justified in denying that the materials they embodied may be contemporaneous with the events recorded in them." Dr. James Robertson, professor of Oriental language in the University of Glasgow, maintains that "the modern critical theory raises in the way of its own acceptance difficulties of

a much more serious kind than are those which it professes to overcome." "It postulates," he says, "miracles of a literary and psychological kind which contradict sound reason and experience as much as any of the physical miracles of the Old Testament transcend them."

Bishop Ellicott says:

"Some of us are old enough to remember how books of the New Testament, about the design of which no reasonable doubt could be entertained, were regarded simply as the outcome of the controversies that arose between Judaism and Gentile Christianity. Where now are these theories? Cast away long since on the waste heap of baseless speculations, exploded and forgotten. And that such will be the fate of a large portion of those that we are now considering in reference to the Old Testament, is certainly not a very hazardous prophecy.

"Inability to accept the supernatural is the distinctive feature of the analytical system; all its results patently disclose it; all its investigations unconsciously presuppose it. How modifications of such a system, or deductions that may be drawn from it, however cautiously and guardedly, can ever be used to help failing faith, especially in such an age as our own, is to me inconceivable."

Thus, there are critics who have grappled successfully with the men who in the name of "modern scholarship," have persistently pressed assumptions, guesses and hypotheses upon the attention of the Church and the world as "assured results."

The only effectual remedy for the evils of rash, irreverent and destructive criticism is the slower but more edifying criticism of men who love truth too much either to rush into hasty conclusions or to reject conclusions which are really justified by facts that have been fully ascertained. It is after many years of that sort of painstaking and veracious study that the distinguished and industrious scholar, Dr. James Orr, now at last publishes his own conclusions, and the sum of them is this:

"The case which the critics present must be met in a calm, temperate, and scholarly way, if it is to be dealt with to the satisfaction of thoughtful Christian people. On the other hand, those who come to this book expecting to find in it agreement with the methods and results of the reigning critical schools will probably be disappointed. The author has here no option. With

the best will in the world to accept whatever new light criticism may have to throw on the structure and meaning of the Old Testament, he has to confess that his study of the critical developments—now for over thirty years—has increasingly convinced him that, while biblical students are indebted to the critics and to Old Testament science generally for valuable help, the Graf-Wellhausen hypothesis, now in the ascendant, is neither in its methods nor its results entitled to the unqualified confidence often claimed for it. He is persuaded, on the contrary, that it rests on erroneous fundamental principles, is eaten through with subjectivity, and must, if carried out to its logical issues,—to which, happily, very many do not carry it,—prove subversive of our Christian faith, and of such belief in and use of the Bible as alone can meet the needs of a living Church. Only, if this is to be shown, it must, as far as one's knowledge enables him to do it, be done thoroughly and with due regard for all really ascertained facts."

5. We may affirm once more that the work of this school is still further discredited by an unsatisfactory and even dangerous position, it takes in the sphere of Christian teaching. Much of the contention of the critics is on the question of when and how the books of the Bible came into existence, and however unreliable and fantastic their theories may seem to many Christian scholars, yet it is affirmed that the Bible still remains to us an effective and useful book with its spiritual contents unchanged and its pedagogic value unimpaired. Those who set up this claim are not greatly troubled when large portions of the Bible are relegated to the domain of myth and tradition, for they are intent only on its spiritual teaching. This is an unsatisfactory and dangerous position for when the historical accuracy and truthfulness of its writers have been impeached, the Bible must inevitably lose much of its authority in matters of faith and life. With this school it seems to be a strong ground of commendation, as it is expressed by one of them that "he pays no heed to orthodoxy or heterodoxy, regarding them as phrases without meaning." We entirely dissent from that view and would even go so far as to say that the Bible may be taught in such a way and by such a teacher as to actually make it an instrument of irreligion. We have in mind a Unitarian minister who was accustomed in his work as a teacher of religion to tell New Testa-

ment stories to the children of the Sunday School, usually prefacing them with remarks to the effect that they were not true at all, they never really happened, but were good stories that intelligent people ought to know and with which not infrequently some good lesson was connected. We seriously doubt the pedagogic value or the ethical suggestion of the best of stories given upon such principles. This may be new pedagogics but it is valueless religion. This separation of the Gospel from the literary documents in which that Gospel is conveyed to us is not likely to be of any value to the educated or uneducated mind in the sphere of morals and religion. This speaking reverently of Jesus by some who pose as though they were His special champions and had a monopoly of attainments, in biblical theology is not consistent with a method of literary criticism that would well-nigh render the life of Jesus valueless, as a mere exemplar in righteousness not to say anything of the greater aspects of His work as Redeemer. It is He who stands forth before the world through all the ages as the subject of these writings, their burden and fulfilment and declares them to be the Word of God that cannot lie or err, or fail or pass away, though heaven and earth may pass away, until all be fulfilled. In the critical discussions of the last century Strauss himself asserted that according to his notion the historical Christ was lost but that his ideal divine-human Christ was left. But how little support an ideal Christianity had, when the historical foundation had once been removed, soon became evident. But a few years passed after the appearance of his "Life of Jesus," before the entire Christian doctrine with which Strauss had comforted his readers in an appendix was torn to pieces and scattered. Those who had comforted themselves with the assurance that this capable man would build up dogmatically what he had torn down historically found themselves early in depressing disappointment.

This age of ferment and criticism we are assured is going to turn back to a fuller and broader study of the Scriptures and of the ages that cradled them at their birth. Some fresh light is breaking and a broader and deeper foundation is being laid, and the old Bible of our affection and redemption will stand more commandingly among men. Loyal and able defenders are always being equipped for its conflicts. We can afford to possess our souls and await with tranquility and assurance the outcome.

In her conflicts with the powers of the world, the arrogance of science, the pride of philosophy, the haughtiness and perversions of criticism, the boastfulness of rationalism, and the malignity of unbelief, let it always be remembered that the Word of the Lord is always panoplied with the native vigor of its own divine strength and with the spiritual power of its own heaven-provided weapons.

In what we have written honest critics have been in mind, but it is well known that rationalism, agnosticism, atheism and other old foes of the Gospel have found it convenient to adopt the dress of the destructive criticism. This whole critical movement has grown out of the attempt to interpret religion and history in the light of an evolutionary philosophy—a delusive and impossible task. But this is too long a story to enter here.

*Hamma Divinity School, Springfield, Ohio.*

## ARTICLE II.

## THE OPPORTUNITY OF LUTHERANS.

BY REV. W. A. LAMBERT.

A few years from now the world will celebrate the four hundredth anniversary of the Reformation. Already two works of importance have appeared in preparation of that celebration. Neither of them is the work of a Lutheran. In fact, one is written by a scholar who has been noted rather for a liberal interpretation of the New Testament, the other is the son of an Old Testament critic. Neither of them may therefore reckon upon any appreciation from the Lutheran Church beyond that accruing to him from his "Life of Luther."

At the time of the anniversary of Luther's birth, in 1883, preparations were being made by a Lutheran scholar in America to write a standard "Life of Luther in English." That work was not completed, and no other American Lutheran scholar has arisen to resume the task. Now the honor has gone to another, for it will for a long time be almost impossible to produce a work to rival that of Preserved Smith. What a glorious opportunity the American Lutheran Church missed!

How much will this same Church leave for the non-Lutherans to do in celebration of the four hundredth anniversary of the Reformation?

This is only a fragment of a far larger question: How much does the American Lutheran Church recognize the magnificent opportunities lying before it, and in how far is it willing that the work which it could do and ought to be doing shall be done by others? How far is it willing to be a leader among the Churches, and how far is it willing to be merely a sect among the Churches? Or, rather, one ought to say, a group of sects among the Churches?

We Lutherans are very glad to boast of our heritage, and of the great things which are being and have been done by Lutherans. It rarely occurs to us to ask, to what extent we are sincere and straightforward in our claims. When the census officials sum up the membership of Lutheran bodies in America, and, con-

fused by the divisions of the Lutheran Church, fail to give proper credit to the total, we feel indignant. When we speak of the total Lutheran population of the world, we are careful to count all Lutherans. But when we speak of Lutherans among ourselves, we are ready with our distinctions. Here are true Lutherans, there half Lutherans, there poor Lutherans, and there unfaithful Lutherans. That is, we count Lutherans to our advantage, and we distinguish between Lutherans to flatter ourselves that we are better than others of the name. Which of our definitions of Lutheranism is correct? Then we claim that Lutheranism is the true Protestant Christianity, but define it carefully only by its distinguishing marks, as a separate and distinct branch of Protestantism, which can have little or no connection with the rest of Protestantism. We speak much of the correctness of the teaching of the Lutheran Church, but are woefully at a loss to define exactly what that teaching is. In America we have not produced a system of doctrine, we have only translated a Lutheran History of Doctrines. The task of making Lutheran theology to speak in English we have left to the Scotch and the English, the Episcopalians and Congregationalists and Free Church scholars. And now we have left to others the opportunity of writing a classical "Life of Luther in English."

But all this is not enough. In the great movements of thought in theology and history and philosophy, where the Lutheran Church has a right to be heard, and a message worth hearing, we are doing practically nothing. Who else can do for modern Christianity what Lutheranism might be doing? It has the Gospel in a purer form, with less philosophical admixture than any other Church; and it preaches it only to its own people in a language out of touch with the thinking of men of to-day, and thinks it has done its duty. It sees the errors of others, and criticises, but either will not or cannot build up where it sees others tear down. Some day, I suppose, when others have built up again, by borrowing from European Lutherans, whom we now scarcely acknowledge as Lutherans, we will point with pride to their success and claim them and a share in their merit. But now we are conservative to a fault, so conservative that we cannot even reach up to Luther, but must stop with the lesser dogmaticians. For Luther too in his day was a higher critic; he was a historical critic, and expressed views which we to-day

must repudiate. We are sure that if he lived to-day, he would not say what he said then.

A short time ago a book-reviewer wrote in the "Nation": "If Dr. Martin Luther were alive to-day, one would scarcely expect to find him preaching justification by faith, or any other doctrine to which the world has grown indifferent. He would be, most probably, a belligerent prophet of some dangerous new religion—perhaps a communistic anarchist, or leader of the assembling hosts of Socialism." The reviewer was right in part. Luther would not be preaching some doctrine to which the world had grown indifferent, but he would wake up the world to see that the doctrine of justification by faith is not a doctrine to which men can be indifferent. He would not waste time and energy combatting minor doctrines of minor men, but would go to the heart of matters with fearless courage and honesty. And these are what the Lutheran Church needs to-day.

Courage and honesty. Of course they are Lutheran virtues, like all others that are worth having. But what a splendid showing of courage we make when we are afraid of the questions the modern mind is raising, for fear our faith might be lost! And what resplendent honesty it is, that we are willing to manifest in a double system of book-keeping, on the one hand subscribing to modern science, where it does not seem to conflict with the theology of the seventeenth century, and on the other hand denying to that same science all right to existence whenever we fear that it may conflict with a cherished tradition! And how honest it is, to ascribe to our Confessions multitudinous positions which they did not and could not take! Is it courage, which has based the Confessions upon the Scriptures and then based the view of Scripture we hold upon the Confessions? Is it courage, is it honesty, when we have hurled into the teeth of the Roman Catholics, that our faith rests upon Scriptures, to hurl into the teeth of the critic who studies the Scriptures: But you must study the Scriptures in the light of the Confessions?

Can we face the history of our Confessions and take them at their own estimate? Harnack has written: "Luther had first to find the truth, and when he had found it, he sold all that he had, to gain it for himself and for Christendom. He sold the most glorious possession of the age, the unity of the Catholic Church: he broke it into ruins, without taking thought of the

'weak,' and at the cost of all his old heaven-earthly ideals; but his followers are so weak and cautious, that they are not even willing to admit that they have learned anything new, and are in imminent danger of selling themselves to a tradition of yesterday, or—risking all evangelical knowledge—retreat to Greek dogma." DG III<sup>3</sup> 612. Is it a truth, or is it a slander?

Look into the dogmaticians, and see the development. Note the rise of a new, a Protestant scholasticism: the revival of a traditional theology on a Protestant basis. Note the formation of the Formula of Concord, a compromise made possible because the leaders of controversy were dead, and the issues were dying; note the growth of a fundamentally Catholic Church idea in Protestantism, which has reached its height in the Missouri Synod, although it can be found in Hollaz. Of course much has been made of the providential guiding of history in the formation of the Formula of Concord, and the logical and historical necessity of its formulation. But, do we not forget that it is a simple matter for a man to trace the hand of Providence in any connected series of events? The most rascally criminal can see the hand of Providence in the many escapes he has made, and can then, when caught, see the hand of Providence in his capture and repentance. But that tracing of the hand of Providence neither proves that his crimes were predestined, nor that his repentance is genuine.

Granted, however, that the Formula of Concord is providentially formed in the way we now have it, and that the Augustana without it would be incomplete, what is the Formula of Concord and what does it claim to be? Is it not just as important to know what it does not contain, as to see what is contained in it? It claims to be a statement of the solution of controversies which had troubled the Church, and a testimony to future generations of the manner in which those controversies were held to be solved according to the Scriptures. Two things the Formula of Concord could not do: It could not claim to be the final solution of all controversies that might arise, and it could not claim to be the infallible or even inerrant interpreter of Scripture. "Other symbols and books are not judges like the Holy Scripture, but only a testimony and explanation of the faith, telling in what manner the Holy Scriptures have at each time, (i.e., at the time of their writing), been understood and explained by the men

then living, in the points in dispute in the Church of God, and the teaching opposed to it rejected and condemned." (Epitome.)

As Confessions of Faith these Confessional Books are not laws, but testimonies. They have their legal side, in that they were adopted at the time by the lords of the Church as the standard for teaching in their Churches. But they were standards of teaching only because they were Confessions of Faith.

Even as Confessions of Faith they have a marked peculiarity. They are the Confessions of Churches, not of individuals. And with few exceptions they were political documents. And as such they were not intended for the laity. The Formula of Concord rightly selects as the Layman's Bible the one Confession which is personal, the Catechism.

As historical Confessions of the Lutheran Churches, teaching how the fathers understood the Bible, these Confessions are invaluable. As final authorities either as to the essence of Lutheranism or as to the true meaning of Scripture, they become a burden too heavy for any Protestant Church to carry. And worse than that, they destroy the appreciation of the essence of faith.

The faith which Luther brought to light was not a new and correct teaching, but a life of trust in God and in Jesus Christ. The Confessions of the Lutheran Church are of value in so far as in their time they strove to defend this center, not always most wisely, against all attack. But the moment they draw faith to themselves, and convert it from trust into belief, they are a curse to the Church. The moment they detract the attention from the Scriptures and the needs of living men to whom the Scriptures must in each age be applied, they are worse than useless, they are a positive hindrance to the Church.

And yet, in our day one could wish that the Lutheran Church had so accepted the Confessional Books *in toto*, and then studied them *in toto*. For they would then have driven to a study of the Scriptures. They themselves throw out the challenge; they want to be tested by the Scriptures. They do not vouch for the verbal inspiration of the Bible, they do not attest the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, they do not even insist that the Gospels are written by the men whose names are attached to them. These are not matters of faith, but of science, and they are not made matters of faith by the Confessions. If we seek for providen-

tial influence we may well find it here. When men went back to Luther, and built a new Protestant tradition upon him, they could find no insistence upon these matters in his writings. Nor on many other points which have since then become prominent in the Church. The whole prolegomena to the systems of the dogmaticians were constructed independently of Luther. That is, when scholasticism made a tradition going back to Luther, it could do it only upon the basis furnished it by Melanchthon. And now the men who would most vigorously attack Melanchthon must do it with the weapons given them by Melanchthon himself.

What an opportunity there lies before the Lutheran Church to-day! To get back to its Confessions as they are, not as they are thought to be, to their testimony to the truth as found in Scripture, and to their challenge to test that truth by Scripture. To get at the heart of them in the Confession of faith in Christ, and not to cling to the form of them as the settlement of controversies long since dead; to build upon them a theology and a witness to the truth which will be intelligible to the modern mind. To give up not one jot or tittle of the gold they contain, but not to choke on the forms in which it is contained; to enter the life and the thought of to-day as the scholastics and the dogmaticians and the authors of the Confessions entered into the life and thought of their day, and to carry with us the strength of faith, the honesty of intellect, the courage to face problems which they and Luther before them manifested.

But all this is not within the reach of those who take refuge behind statements that applied to other times, and insist that the present must accept them or perish. Luther might have done that, and saved the world the annoyance and himself the anxiety of a reformation of the Church. Before Luther's day the Roman Catholic Church had its system practically complete. To-day the charge is made that had he known Thomas Aquinas he would not have become a reformer. But Thomas Aquinas was not inaccessible and he would not have satisfied Luther. To-day the world is restless; the scientists and philosophers who a few years ago would have nothing to do with religion, are seeking one. And they are turning to Christianity for a religion. They despair of the Churches because the Churches seem to be out of touch with the times. Can the Lutheran Church, with its grasp

on the essentials of the Gospel, now, four hundred years after the Reformation, hold its own, and appeal to men as the teaching of Luther did then? Or, shall we let others learn of us what the heart of the Gospel is, and leave us behind, as a Church of the past, of tradition, of a theology that is inconsistent with science, even the science of the study of the Bible?

*South Bethlehem, Pa.*

## ARTICLE III.

## THE RITSCHLIAN THEOLOGY.

BY WILLIAM ROSENSTENGEL, D. D.

It is nearly twenty years ago that Professor Dr. F. H. R. von Frank of Erlangen made the following prediction concerning Ritschl's theology: "The time will come when the period in the development of the new theology will be viewed with some feeling of shame. Not so much because of the commotion it has created in the church and the confusion it has caused, but because of the thoughtlessness and the immaturity of mind with which this doctrine has been appropriated. It is humiliating to think that there was a time when such young theologians were its mouth-piece."<sup>1</sup>

This prophecy of Professor von Frank has, as far as I am in a position to judge, not yet been fulfilled. That "feeling of shame" does not seem to have come as yet over the followers of Ritschl by any means, to say nothing of repentance for the great harm done to the church and its members. The new theology has not yet run its course although, judging from more recent occurrences in the land and home of its founder, it appears as if it had passed the meridian of its popularity. The harvest of the sowing of this School has been ripening very fast of late years, and the fruit has been anything but wholesome and delicious. This has been fully made known in the case of Rev. Jatho, in the city of Cologne. It is generally conceded that the social democracy is largely the outcome of Ritschl's liberalism as taught by his followers in the universities and in the pulpits. Pastor Mehliss, superintendent in Hildesheim, Hanover, wrote some time ago in "Der alte Glaube," among other things, the following: "The common liberalism has produced free-thinking and finally social democracy, which latter has consistently further developed the liberal and free-thinking doctrines and is now ready to carry its aged ancestors to the grave, or at least step in as an heir. Many of the advocates of the modern negative

<sup>1</sup> *Vademecum für angehende Theologen*, p. 309.

theology have fallen or gone far ahead of their fathers and companions. How far have the Friends of Evangelical Freedom not advanced above their founder Ritschl! Ex-pastor Goehre is now already a genuine social democrat, and many others have advanced so far that, in addition to their many so-called exaggerations and errors of the New Testament, they have put the question: 'Has Jesus really lived?' And answered it by a definite 'No'".

Seeing then that Ritschlism is largely responsible for the deplorable religious conditions in Germany, it may not be amiss even at this seemingly late hour, briefly to point out his false teaching regarding some of the fundamental doctrines of the church.

#### I. CONCERNING THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

I think it proper to begin right here, for the Scriptures must forever constitute our standard, the only infallible rule of faith and practice, by which every man's religion and theology must be tested. What position does Ritschl take with reference to the Bible as an inspired book? To my mind this question precedes all others in the settlement of a man's orthodoxy. To be sure, Ritschl wishes to base his teaching on the Bible, but how does he do this? He at once pushes aside the Old Testament as a source of proof-texts. He says: "The theology, which the Christian religion is to recognize from the original sources, is to be confined only to the writings of the New Testament." And again: "The theology which is to present the authentic contents of the Christian religion in a positive form, must be taken from the books of the New Testament and from no other source."<sup>2</sup> He considers it a mistake in theology to go to the Old Testament for proof-texts. Isaiah 53 is "apocryphal." Not only does this chapter, according to his views, interrupt the connection of prophecy in its entirety, but its contents are not followed up in the succeeding chapters. This forces the conclusion that originally it was foreign to the book of the Babylonian Isaiah, and only accidentally, on account of the similarity in the name of the subject, inserted in the book."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> *Justification and Atonement*, vol. II, 13, 16, 18.

<sup>3</sup> *Justification and Atonement*, II, p. 62. Quoted by "Lehre und Wehre," Vol. XL, p. 282.

But even the New Testament is not to be accepted in its entirety. The Acts of the Apostles are a "secondary writing" and the Apocalypse as to its main body a "Jewish production." In fact the way and manner he speaks even of Paul's writings leaves the impression that he considered them not much more than mere human productions. For instance: "The judgments of Paul as they appear now and then about the law are not thought out in systematic order." "It must in this connection especially be considered that he made a transfer to Christianity from Pharisaism. The double line of arguments in which the Christian Apostle moves are proof how individualistic, yea, how pathological his views along these lines are."<sup>4</sup> In a similar manner Ritschl speaks about other passages in Paul's writings. Does this sound as if he considered Paul an inspired writer? Yea, he plainly designates the Biblical accounts mere historical monuments. Prof. Kuebel quotes from his works the following sentence: "One can do without the means of a dubious theory of inspiration." That means as much as to say, one can do without the means of any theory of inspiration.

From these few quotations it will be seen how Ritschl stood regarding the Bible. No wonder then that we see him using the greatest liberty in interpreting and applying the teachings of the sacred volume.

Ritschl, as those who know something about his theology need scarcely be told, insisted on doing away with all metaphysics in theology. But what does he include under that term? Luthardt reminds Ritschl of the fact, that the word metaphysics is a very "elastischer Begriff," which may be expanded in such a way as to include most anything. He says: "Metaphysics is to be excluded from theology. Now this and that comes under the category of metaphysics, therefore this and that must be excluded from theology. And thus we see immediately the trinity, the divine-human in Christ and a multitude of other parts which we have considered hitherto as essential parts of the Christian faith and the Christian doctrine, shown out of doors. Nothing more simple than that."<sup>5</sup> Then Luthardt continues showing the fallacy in the use of the term metaphysics. "For,"

<sup>4</sup> *Rechtfertigung* II, p 313. Quoted by Prof. Kuebel: *Ueber den Unterschied, &c.*, p. 184.

<sup>5</sup> *Zur Beurteilung der Ritschlischen Theologie. Zeitschrift*, 1881, p. 620.

says he, "the existence and absoluteness of God, the Trinity, the preexistence and essential divinity of Christ, &c., all these questions are with me not questions of metaphysics, but of the contents of the Christian faith."<sup>6</sup>

In order to prove his theory relating to metaphysics as the correct one, Ritschl denies the validity of the question as to "Seinsurteile," judgments as to being, and would only allow "Werturteile," judgments as to value. He says: "In Christianity and its theology it does not depend on *being* but on the significance, on *valuation*; not what God, what Christ, what the resurrection *is*, but what value they have for us." One meets these high-sounding, philosophical terms in the writings of Ritschl and his followers again and again. And yet if they are examined in the light of Scripture what do they amount to? Luthardt is of the opinion that you cannot separate the judgment as to *value* from the judgment as to *being*. By way of illustration he refers to Luther's explanation of the second article in the Apostles Creed, that Jesus Christ "is my Lord, who redeemed me, a lost and condemned creature," &c., but what must he *be* in order that he can be this to me? Luther prefixed the following: "I believe that Jesus Christ, true God, &c.," and he knew well why he did so. Who does not see the fallacy of Ritschl's argumentation! What does my judgment about anything amount to unless it be based on an intelligent knowledge of that thing? True, I cannot fathom with my understanding the being of God, of the Trinity, &c., but on this account I do not say these doctrines belong to the category of metaphysics with which I have nothing to do, but I say they are doctrines of divine revelation, and as such I believe and accept them.

Ritschl is correct in saying that the task for the evangelical theologian is to interpret Scripture by Scripture; but listen to the following: "In doing so it depends not only on grammatical knowledge and logical skill, in order to understand the single passages in connection with the whole, but especially on the esthetical application, viz., the art to reproduce from the right view-point the extent, the relations, the altitude (Höhenlage) of the religion of the Old Testament, in order also to understand the documents of Christianity in their original and historical

<sup>6</sup> *Idem, Zeitschrift, 1881, p. 619.*

sense."<sup>7</sup> On this "Lehre und Wehre" rightly remarks: "We decline with thanks such misinterpretation of the otherwise correct principle: 'Scriptura Scripturam interpretatur,' the hermeneutic rule of the 'esthetic application,' which, as Ritschl's example immediately demonstrates, is effected after a wholly incalculable subjective taste and preconceived idea."

Ritschl also speaks about classical and non-classical proof-texts, yet when even a "classical" text does not answer his purpose, he explains it away. Of course, since the entire Old Testament is not to be considered in the support of any Christian doctrine, the church is robbed, so to speak, at one sweep of many precious proof-texts. The "servant" in Isaiah 53, who was wounded for our transgressions and bruised for our iniquities is, according to Ritschl "likely not a prophetic personage, but a member of the royal family."

One sees with what ease Ritschl disposes of classical proof-texts. His views concerning the Scriptures must necessarily affect every other Biblical doctrine.

## II. CONCERNING GOD.

It might be said in the beginning that Ritschl's God differs from the God revealed to us in the Bible. That seems to be saying a great deal, but it is true. His rejection of the Old Testament in the support of Christian doctrines, means nothing less than the rejection of the Old Testament God, the God, who hates and punishes Sin and visits the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation—the God, who has revealed himself through the law to the chosen people as the *holy one*; before whom the seraphim stand and cry out: "Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord of hosts: the whole earth is full of his glory." Is. 6,3.

The God of the Bible reveals himself to us as a distinct personal being. As such he constantly stands before us from the first chapter of Genesis to the last chapter of the Apocalypse. He reveals himself to us by certain attributes. "They are the essence of God itself, regarded under various modes or respects of consideration." We refer here only to such of these as come within the scope of our discussion, viz.: *holiness, justice and love.*

7 Quoted by *Lehre und Wehre* Vol. XL, p. 283.

Now let us see what Ritschl thinks of these. He writes: "The idea of holiness is in its Old Testament sense, for various reasons in Christianity not legitimate and in its New Testament use not clear."<sup>8</sup> To this Professor Kuebel remarks: "We scarcely consider any other word of Ritschl with such deep suspicion and as fundamentally false."

It is certainly difficult to understand why the holiness of God as represented in the Old Testament should not be legitimate or have no place in Christianity. Ritschl says "for various reasons," but he does not tell us in so many words what they are. He might have done so, but he preferred to have us draw our own inferences, and this, I am sure, is not very difficult after we have become better acquainted with him. He would also have us believe that the idea of God's holiness, which accompanies the Old Testament religion, was "knocked off" in the New Testament. He is especially concerned to get around such passages as lay stress on the holiness of God in contrast with men's sinfulness.

Now holiness and justice are closely allied. Because God is the holy One, he cannot endure sin. The sinner must suffer punishment. "For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men." Rom. 1.18. "Thou art righteous, O Lord, which art, and wast, and shalt be, because thou hast judged thus." Rev. 16:5.

Ritschl would make us believe further that all the attributes of God are concentrated in *love*, and to this end he quotes with much emphasis 1. John 4:8, "God is love". He speaks of the love of God as if by this attribute the very essence and being of God were absorbed. When Professor von Frank of Erlangen protested against such teaching, Ritschl expressed his surprise that a Lutheran theologian should do so, pointing at the same time to Luther by way of justification. But, if the old saying: "Duo si idem dicunt non est idem," applies to any two men, these two are Luther and Ritschl. But right here Ritschl prepares the way for his doctrine on the person and work of Christ. But before we come to that point, it will be necessary to ask what he teaches concerning sin.

<sup>8</sup> *Rechtfertigung*, Vol. III, p. 280.

## III. CONCERNING SIN.

Regarding the doctrine of sin Ritschl is a Pelagian. He denies original sin. He says: "Luther's view that the doctrine of inherited sin is revealed in the Scriptures, rests on a false interpretation of some single passages." "That the individual confession, Ps. 51:5, can be no proof for a general doctrinal truth, is not to be doubted." Further: "The expression 'children of wrath,' Eph. 2:3, refers to the active earlier sinning of those, who now as Christians, dare apply to themselves the divine sentiment of grace over against wrath." Certainly a poor attempt to get rid of "by nature children of wrath."

With reference to Romans 5:12, "Wherefore, as by one man Sin entered into the world, and death by Sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned," Ritschl thinks that it can probably never be made clear what Paul's idea was when he wrote that sentence. He is also of the opinion that the dogma concerning original Sin, according to the norm of the old theological School, could not be upheld, for dogmas had to be based on clear passages of writ. And yet when this is done, a work which the old School of theologians did conscientiously and with great care, he takes exception to the use of such passages.<sup>9</sup>

Luthardt is of the opinion that in Ritschl's view of Sin the last roots of nearly all of his departures from the doctrines of the Church can be found. We are rather inclined to say that the "last roots" of his departure from the doctrines of the Church are found in his rejection of an infallible Bible. For the doctrine of sin is a doctrine of divine revelation and one, who does not accept the Bible as divinely inspired, can hardly be expected to accept its teaching on one of its most fundamental doctrines. Says the Apostle: "I had not known Sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, 'Thou shalt not covet.'" Rom. 7:7. With Ritschl sin is essentially a matter of ignorance.

Such being his views regarding this all important doctrine, what must we expect when we come to his teaching concerning Christ.

<sup>9</sup> *Lehre und Wehre*, Vol. XLI, p. 100.

## IV. CONCERNING JESUS CHRIST AND HIS WORK.

We wonder, indeed, what he is going to make of Jesus Christ and his mission on earth. "Lehre und Wehre" says on this point: "If there is no damning guilt of sin, is it only an illusion of the imagination, that God, who is love, could be angry with man on account of sin? If there is no such thing as a separation of God from man, then, as a matter of course it is an entirely wrong and wholly absurd idea that Christ, the Son of God, should have come that through his suffering and death, as our substitute, through his willing sacrifice once made, he might appease the wrath of God on account of sin, and through it earn for us the forgiveness of our sin."

We refer here first to the teachings of Ritschl and his School on the divinity of Christ. Of course, they pretend to hold fast to that doctrine, they also make use of the prevailing terminology of the Church, but they do it with a different meaning. One calls their doctrine on the divinity of Christ a "wicked forgery." Let us hear what Ritschl himself has to say. He writes: "It is an incorrect presupposition that from the New Testament a harmonious doctrine of the divinity of Christ can be detected. In a strict sense the contents of the books of the New Testament are generally not doctrinal. At least in the discourses of Christ we discover no doctrine of his divinity."<sup>10</sup>

First, we are told that for Christian doctrines only the books of the New Testament can furnish the material, and here the statement is made that their contents generally are not doctrinal. Where then are we to look for Christian doctrines? We are told also that in the discourses of Christ no doctrine of his divinity can be discovered. That surely ought to be sufficient to settle the question. One can not but be surprised meeting with such sweeping assertions.

But what about that "wicked forgery"? We have already noticed how, whilst Ritschl seeks to do away with all metaphysics in theology, he himself employs arguments and ideas that are nothing short of metaphysics. In the doctrine concerning the divinity of Christ, he would make us believe that it did not depend so much on the question as to what Christ *is* as to his

10 *Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*, Vol. III, p. 378.

worth for us. Strange! As if the question of the *being* of Christ were of no importance. And yet this question has been *the* question in all ages. We call attention to Isaiah 9:6, "His name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace," of course, this passage belongs to the Old Testament. But what of Christ's own question, "Whom do men say that I, the Son of man, am"? Matt. 16:13. And again v. 15, "But whom say ye that I am"? Why did not our Lord consider this question as belonging to the category of metaphysics? And was not this question *the* question before the Jewish Sanhedrim when Caiaphas cried out: "I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God?" Matt. 26:63. And what of St. John's Gospel? Is not the doctrine of our Lord's divinity the silver thread that runs through that entire book? What of those passages: "I and my Father are one." John 10:30. "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father, and how sayest thou then, shew us the Father"? John 14:9. And verse 11: "Believe me that I am in the Father, and the Father in me: or else believe me for the very work's sake?" Does Ritschl think that the Church is ready once for all to dismiss this question as belonging to the category of metaphysics, which need not concern us? If so, he is mistaken. He and his School consider it sufficient to say with the catechism: "I believe Jesus Christ to be my Lord." But those other words belonging to these: "His only Son, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost," &c., are "unintelligible formulas." It will be remembered how some years ago Harnack made an attack on the Apostles Creed right at this point. In his lecture, "Das Evangelium und der Gottessohn, oder die Frage der Christologie," one fails to find the Christ of the Bible or of our confessions. He makes a great deal of Christ's consciousness that he is the Son of God. "How he came to this consciousness of his unique relation as Son, how he came to the consciousness of his power and the obligation and task, which lie in this power, that is a mystery and no psychology will solve it." This is the same sort of argumentation which we find with Ritschl. What ever cannot be explained rationally, belongs to the category of mystery or metaphysics. You hardly ever hear men of this school speak of the "mysteries of faith." The fact is *faith* isn't a very important factor in their theology.

Since Ritschl rejects the doctrine of original Sin and the guilt in consequence of it resting upon the sinner, what use is there to speak of Jesus Christ as our Redeemer and of the sacrifice which he made in his own body on the cross in order to make atonement for our sins, reconciling the world unto himself? But what is the significance of Christ's death? His death came as an "accident" in consequence of the faithfulness of his calling. Ritschl is here a Socinian. In fact the similarity between Socinianism and the school of Ritschl is very striking. As far as the fundamentals of the Christian religion are concerned, rationalists of different types and in different ages of the Church, meet on common ground, it is only on minor points and in the way of presenting their ideas, that we find a difference.

Ritschl's theology pierces the very heart of Christianity when it sets aside the whole idea of a vicarious atonement. Luthardt designated Ritschl's theology as "another Christianity." I would go still further and say, that it has no claim to the word "Christian" at all. If that all consoling doctrine of the forgiveness of my sins through Jesus Christ as my divine human Saviour is an illusion, what is there yet in Christianity that can seriously appeal to me! Take away the cross of Christ, in its true Pauline sense, and what sort of a Christianity is there left? Ritschl didn't want to have it said that he had emptied Christianity of its contents, but his theology proves it. He wished to be considered a good Lutheran and even the true interpreter of Luther, yet it needs only a very superficial knowledge of his teachings and the teachings of Luther to see the deep gulf between them. The words which Luther spoke to Zwingli at the Colloquy at Marburg: "Ihr habt einen andern Geist als wir," he would have even with greater emphasis applied to Ritschl.

Before closing this article, I wish to quote Dr. M. Valentine. In his "Christian Theology," (Vol. II. 138 f.) he writes with reference to the Ritschian theology: (It) "sets aside the whole idea of a vicarious atonement by Christ, and makes forgiveness independent of such provision, and purely an unmediated action of God's Fatherhood. Its contention insists on remodeling the traditional church-doctrine of Christ's priesthood and sacrifice. It repudiates the legal relations and forensic character of justification, and asserts this to be, not an act of God as Lawgiver or

moral Ruler, but only as a gracious Father in simply paternal pardon. It denies that this fatherly Love needs to pay tribute to holiness in connection with remission, and teaches that 'the righteousness of God' to be maintained and exhibited in connection with it, is simply 'His self consistent and undeviating action on behalf of the members of his community' and is 'in its essence identical with His grace.' Christ's 'priesthood' is reduced to maintaining such a character and fellowship of piety with God as to have free and acceptable approach to Him in worship, prayer and intercession—which priestly function was accomplished through his example of sincere and trusting faith in the Father's ever forgiving love."

The most astonishing utterance on the part of Dr. Luthardt in his "Zur Beurteilung der Ritschl'schen Theologie," I find in the following sentence: "He [Ritschl] knows in general, of no personal relation to God and Christ in the proper sense." This was written whilst Ritschl was yet living. Whilst at first one is utterly at a loss to comprehend such a position on the part of a man, a teacher of the Christian religion, yet a little closer thought will satisfy one, that this is but the logical outcome of the combined religious thinking process of the man. With Ritschl the individual Christian is absorbed by the congregation, the "Gemeinde." And right here we see how closely he approaches the doctrine of the Roman church. The individual needs to have no personal relation to God and Christ, if he is in the Church, he is in the ark of safety. The layman in the Catholic church knows in general very little of a personal relation to God and Christ; it is all the relation to his priest. Indeed, Ritschlian ideas are the very opposite of those which Luther proclaimed when he brought the individual soul near to its God. In this individual longing for communion with God, in the agony of the consciousness of guilt before a just and holy One, in the struggle of that soul for forgiveness of sin, the Reformation was born. But these are not the things that concern Ritschl.

Frank of Erlangen had occasion in his day to speak to his students of the popularity of the Ritschlian theology. He told them that the secret of this was not great and could easily be explained. It was a theology agreeable to the taste. What did he mean by this? "Lehre und Wehre" gives the answer when

it says: "There can be no such a thing as repentance and conversion in the sense of the Church. In this theology one knows of no sin and of no grace, of no humble and contrite heart, of no anxiety for sin, of no pangs of conscience, of no new and right spirit, of no peace with God." (Vol. 41. p. 145).

Certainly a religion deprived of all these things, ought not to be burdensome to the natural man. It is easily seen how it may become popular in a short time. Need we be surprised to see how it has spread in Germany almost like wild-fire?

Ritschlian theology has gained quite a foot-hold in England and America. A prominent churchman on referring to this fact lately said, that it was introduced here to a great extent by American students, who had gone to Germany and studied under Harnack. Not a few of these now occupied professors' chairs in theological schools in this country. At the ecumenical conference of Methodists in Canada last year, it became evident that there was a wide divergence of opinion among the delegates of that church on theological questions. Dr. Carroll in an address pointed out the marked change that had taken place in late years in pulpit deliverances. Whilst formerly great stress was laid on the horribleness and the fearful consequences of sin and the boundless mercy of God and the glory of heaven, now a fascinating picture of Christ's love and willingness to sacrifice and the beauty of a moral and Christian life, without the dark background, on which formerly so much stress was laid, were the things emphasized.

But what has the new theology accomplished? What are its results? Alas! even some of its own advocates are beginning to have their eyes opened. Pfarrer Dr. Rittelmeyer of Nuremberg publicly confessed in the liberal organ, "Die Christliche Welt," that the millions of working men and the common people looked with suspicion upon the work of the liberals and that even among the educated classes, the number that had in any way been reached was exceedingly small. In "Der alte Glaube," we read this statement: "The Jatho-contention has made it clear that the whole work of Ritschl, of Hermann, of Harnack and their disciples has passed by the mass of our educated without leaving scarcely a trace."

Do we want that kind of theology in America? In our Lu-

theran Synods it has not yet found a foot-hold, as far as our observation goes. We earnestly hope that it never will. May every one of the ministers be ready to say with the great Apostle: "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed," Gal. 1:8.

*Carthage, Ill.*

## ARTICLE IV.

STEPS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF NEW TESTAMENT  
INTERPRETATION.

BY PROFESSOR V. G. A. TRESSLER, D.D., PH.D. (LEIPZIG.)

No doubt most of us have been approached more than once with the inquiry, What is the best Bible to buy? The answer is not so easy, for it implies that there are different kinds of Bibles. This is somewhat startling. Yet it is true. There are different Bibles even in Protestantism. Here is a Handy Reference Bible, the Cross Reference Bible, the Chain Reference Bible and the Paragraph New Testament, and many others. Do you say, Oh, that is the same Bible after all? Not at all. They are types, all modern, of new bottles into which the old wine of the Scripture is poured, with the very laudable hope that it thereby will acquire if not a more piquant flavor at least a more attractive form.

Inasmuch as the giving of the true Gospel to men is the ever-continuing and the high present purpose of the Church, we naturally are interested in this flinging out upon the world of all these varied volumes. Nay, we are more than interested. For at once there is opened up to us a vista full of fear. What sort of Bibles are they anyhow? Who makes them? What New Testament Gospel do they tell? Who is responsible for their appearing? What is the motive of their wide dispersion? Who has written the "cross" and "chain" references? Men who believe Christ is the Son of God, or men who, though "ever learning, have never come to a knowledge of the truth?" Whose is the margin and the superscription, the reference and the gloss? Whose brain determined the punctuation and consequent interpretation in cases where originally there was no marking at all, and where a variation of punctuation meant a change in statement? For it is well known that in the autographs, or at least in the most ancient manuscripts, not only is there no paragraphing or even division into sentences, but actually no word spacing at all, so that there are cases where, as for example Colossians

2:18, different words can be made out of the same passage.<sup>1</sup> Who has determined it?

In the indiscriminate flinging broadcast of unauthorized editions of the Scriptures is there not a real danger? Has not the Roman viewpoint a certain medium of weight?—No Bible to be issued apart from the sanction of the Church; that is, the text and notes must have the credentials of a body of men whose first interest is not the profits of selling, but the purity of teaching. For bear in mind the Bibles we have on our desk color our whole view of Scriptures if they are logically followed.<sup>2</sup>

From this general viewpoint, one may apprehend how many elements there are in the proper interpretation of the Word of God and at how much an earlier stage than one imagines such interpretative forces have their beginning.

*Not only, therefore, must the whole Church give to this matter of Scriptural interpretation the most careful and constant attention but to us as Lutherans it is absolutely vital.* We in the very nature of the case have far and away a greater necessity laid upon us to see to it that "the Word they still must let remain and not a thank have for it." For us the Book itself, in its character and nature, is settled. "The Finality of the Faith" as well as the source of that finality is to us no longer an open question.

Our propaganda is, as I take it, the presentation of the Christ of the Word, through the Word of the Christ. The collects, the hymns, the exposition of our teaching, and the General Synod's recent attestation<sup>3</sup> fix fast the Word in its meaning to us.

This is our interpretation, if you please. It is anti-subjective, anti-naturalistic, and extra-moralistic. That is, we interpret the Word as objective, supernatural and spiritual. But how do we know this? How do we arrive at this conclusion? For just as men get into the New Testament differently, so they get out of it different things. For instance, Prof. Eucken of

1 The Greek may be translated by one division of words, "gloating over things which he hath seen," or by another division, "walking blindly in the air," as it is  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\pi\alpha\kappa\epsilon\nu\theta\alpha\tau\epsilon\nu\omega\nu$  or  $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\pi\alpha\kappa\epsilon\nu\mu\beta\alpha\tau\epsilon\nu\omega\nu$ . Also Matthew 9:18, is it  $\epsilon\iota\sigma\pi\epsilon\theta\omega\nu$  or  $\epsilon\iota\sigma\pi\epsilon\lambda\theta\omega\nu$ ? In Matthew 16:23 shall we read  $\delta\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$  or  $\delta\lambda\lambda' \delta$ .

2 Fortunately for us and the Gospel, men for the most part do not act logically.

3 See General Synod Minutes 1909, page 59.

Jena gets to the Word through his philosophy, now so much translated and spoken about. Missionary Warneck says the South Sea Animists get their first view of Christ not through a sense of sin but of a savior from *fear*, and thence only, their idea of their sins and of a savior therefrom. The New Testament itself shows how one man gets to the Word through his volition<sup>4</sup> and another through the translation of will into action,<sup>5</sup> and still another through true cognition.<sup>6</sup>

These different attitudes of men in their initial attempts upon the Kingdom of God, make natural other attempts, when they have entered that Kingdom, of apprehending that Word. But there must be a norm by which, under and through sane and demonstrable processes, this same Word shall have always and in all places the same definite message to men. Can we find such basic principles of interpretation? Yes, the Church has already at least in part done so.

*The first step to such accredited interpretation is the securing of an adequate text.* "The Word Written" depends for its significance on what *WAS* written. The Church has not been slow to understand this. It has in a general way for centuries, but with a very special emphasis in these last years, put all the wealth of its scholarship at the command especially of the New Testament text. They have ransacked all lands in collecting of manuscripts until there have been found over 5,000 of them, ranging from the tenth century back to the early part of the third. Gregory catalogues 1420 for the Gospels,<sup>7</sup> 514 for the Acts, 515 for the Pauline letters, and 185 for Revelation. This is a very remarkable showing when compared with the manuscript basis of other ancient writings. The tragedies of Aeschyles have but about 50 manuscripts, while much of "Tacitus' Annals" has but one.

The New Testament is in equally favorable light when considered with reference to the small interval of time elapsing between its autographs and the earliest manuscript which we pos-

<sup>4</sup> Rev. 22:17, "And whosoever will, let him take."

<sup>5</sup> John 7:17, "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine."

<sup>6</sup> Eph. 3:19, "And to know the love of Christ that passeth knowledge that ye might be filled with all the fullness of God."

<sup>7</sup> Gregory, Text Kritik des N. T., B'd 1, 1900.

sess. The Sinaitic and Vatican manuscripts are probably of the fourth century. Thus only 250 years from the time of Christ. But the earliest manuscript of Demosthenes is 1200 years after his death. Plato's *Apology* 1300 years after Plato. The oldest manuscript of Sophocles is 1400 years after that great tragedian's death. And Euripides' tragedies come down to us separated by no less than 1600 years from the days of the living dramatist who wrote them.

Thus the New Testament stands entirely apart in the wealth of its documentary attestation, both as regards their number and the age of its witnesses.

Neither time nor space permit more than a mere mention of the additional certification given to the text by the early translations made already in the second century to equip the early missionary church which with reckless enthusiasm went North, South, East and West preaching the Gospel, and *always* in the language of the people. The codification of these witnesses, especially the manuscripts, is even to-day the field of hundreds of expert scholars, while still other manuscripts are constantly being uncovered. Since Tischendorf made his romantic discovery of the Sinaitic manuscript in 1859, there has been a succession of advances towards, if possible, a still more solid New Testament basis. The very oldest piece of New Testament manuscript is a leaf from the second century, discovered by Greenfel and Hunt at Oxyrhyncus in 1896 and containing parts of Matthew. Still more remarkable is the find in Egypt of a complete codex of the Gospels, from the fourth or fifth century, now in possession of C. L. Freer of Detroit, Michigan.

Of versions or ancient translations the very finest and oldest copy we have, is the ancient Syriac Testament which was made about 200 A. D. In addition to this, for the first time, we have since 1888 an Arabic translation of Tatian's *Diatessaron*, to which scholars attach the very highest importance in the certification of the text of the New Testament.

Besides these very valuable new discoveries, one may say with truth that the most valuable of the *older* manuscripts have been really newly discovered. In 1898 for the first time the Codex Sinaiticus was satisfactorily photographed and since then issued

by the Clarendon Press.<sup>8</sup> In 1904 the Vatican Codex was excellently photographed at Milan. Among the versions the Old Latin K, written in North Africa, representing the text of the Gospels used by Cyprian of Carthage in the third century, was published at Oxford in 1886. Hundreds of new and old manuscripts have been examined and catalogued by Prof. Gregory of Leipzig and Prof. Von Soden of Berlin within the last twenty years.

In addition to all this, the early church fathers, through whose copious quotations the New Testament of the first centuries is brought so clearly to our vision, are being edited with critical skill in the *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* of Oxford, 1886. Thus is seen what great advance has even in the last generation been made in this first step of New Testament interpretation which is the settling and securing of the accurate text written by apostles and their contemporaries.

When once the text is before us on a good printed page, *the next step in ascertaining the meaning which these pages convey, is an intelligent and proper apprehension of the language of the New Testament.* It goes without saying that this is a most difficult and delicate task. Greek in itself is a mine of linguistic subtlety. But then we have come to find out that our New Testament Greek is more than Greek. Since the Renaissance, New Testament Greek has been studied unremittingly. We need only name Erasmus to understand this. The best brain and heart of educated Christianity have wrought at this point. In the seventeenth century there was a sharp passage at arms between the Purists and the Helenists. The first claimed absolute classic purity for New Testament Greek and "regarded it a sacrilege to hold that the Holy Spirit should dictate a gospel in any inferior style of Greek prose."<sup>9</sup> The Hebraist pointed out the large number of passages which seemed to be entirely made up in Hebraistic style. This Hebraistic view gradually gained ground. In the end it, too, took a position adverse to a real scientific knowledge of the Greek, holding that "the Holy Spirit demanded a select idiom, which the dogmatists soon assumed." But in

<sup>8</sup> Wittenberg should have a copy.

<sup>9</sup> Angus—Recent Christian Progress, 1909.

spite of this the constantly advancing work of classic philosophy soon proved beyond peradventure that the language of the New Testament was anything but classical, in either style, vocabulary or grammar. Some called it "pigeon Greek."

But in 1822 Prof. Winer published his New Testament Grammar, a work of tremendous erudition, but which while finding and pointing out the many eccentricities of New Testament Greek yet failed to find any principle of organic construction. Then came the study by German scholars like the Schlegels and Herder of Comparative Grammar and the consequent relation of languages. This gradually brought about a change of view. The New Testament began to be studied in its language and expression, not by way of contrast, but by way of contact with others. With this came, after slow tentative investigation, a real revolution in our apprehension of New Testament Greek. We are still in the revolutionary period. But there is no question as to the results.

To Dr. Adolf Deissman, now of Berlin, the New Testament world owes this. He finds, and scholarship is accepting the principle of his "finds," that the New Testament Greek is neither Septuagint Hebrew, nor classic Greek nor yet vulgar doggerel. It is, on the contrary, the Greek language as it was spoken by the common man of that day. The early Aramaic of Palestine soon fell away as Christianity grew into world dimensions. So the New Testament became a Greek book. What Greek was it? Not Attic, Aeolic, Doric or Ionic. The Empire had unified a Greek tongue and caused it to be used for commerce as well as literature. These world Greeks were in business, as canny as a Scot and as thrifty as a German. It was this, *κοινὴ* Greek which the writers of the Gospels used. The view of Prof. Blass of Halle, given out as late as 1894, "that New Testament Greek was to be recognized as something peculiar following its own laws,"<sup>10</sup> has been forever laid aside. The floods of ordinary writings such as copy books, contracts, wills, letters and incidents which have in these very recent years been exhumed prove beyond the shadow of a doubt that the New Testament is written in the colloquial language of its time. And there was nothing isolated about it. It was not an esoteric religion and hence needed no

10 1894, Theol. Lit. Zeitung.

esoteric language. Almost numberless expressions of New Testament type are found in current use. New meanings become apparent. New life is added to the translations. Luke 9:2, "Take nothing for your journey, neither staff nor wallet, nor bread nor money," what is meant by wallet? a travelling bag such as ours? Scarcely! But a Greek inscription of the Roman period has been found in Syria in which a slave is speaking of a successful begging expedition in which he returned with 70 bags, that is, begging bags.<sup>11</sup> Thus the admonition is plain, take neither bread nor begging bag. Scores of illustrations of this sort meet us in "Light from the Ancient East."<sup>12</sup>

Deissman shows how with the aid of papyri and inscriptions there is a resuscitated past "from which the common people have suddenly risen again from the rubbish mounds of their ancient cities, little marked towns and villages."<sup>13</sup>

<sup>14</sup>"From whatever side the New Testament may be regarded by the Greek scholar, the verdict of philology based on contemporary texts of the world surrounding the New Testament will never waver. For the most part the pages of our Sacred Book are so many records of popular Greek in its various grades. Taken as a whole, therefore, the New Testament is a book of the people. Hence we say that Luther in taking the New Testament from the doctors and presenting it to the people, was only giving back to the people their own. We enter, perhaps, an attic room in one of the large cities, and if we find there some poor old body reading her Testament, beside the fuschias and geraniums on the window sill, then we feel that the Old Book is in a position to which its very nature entitles it. Think, too, of the Japanese New Testament found by a Red Cross sister in a wounded man's knapsack during the war between Russia and Japan, that was also a grateful resting place for the Old Book.

We go further, and say: this great Book of the People ought really never be published in sumptuous editions with costly engravings and expensive binding. The Egyptian potsherds with gospel fragments, the Pater Noster from Megares, are in their externals more in keeping with the character of the New

<sup>11</sup> Expository Times, Nov. 1906, p. 61.

<sup>12</sup> Deissman, English translation Hodder & Stoughton, London, 1911.

<sup>13</sup> Ex. Times, March, 1911.

<sup>14</sup> Deissman, Light from Ancient East, 140-141.

Testament than the proposed double crown Bible and the other editions de luxe bought by rich German godfathers for confirmation presents. The plainer the cover, the more modest the type the coarser the paper, the nearer the pictures come to the style of Dürer or Rembrandt, the more fitly will the great Book of the People be arrayed.

The Book of the People has become, in the course of centuries, the Book of all mankind. At the present day no book in the world is printed so often and in so many languages as the New Testament. From the people to mankind at large; historical philology establishes the casual connection underlying this development. The New Testament was not a product of the colorless refinement of an upper class that had nothing left to hope for, whose classical period lay, irretrievable, in the past. On the contrary, it was, humanly speaking, a product of the force that came unimpaired, and strengthened by the Divine Presence, from the lower class (Matt. 11:25; 1 Cor. 1:26-31). This reason alone enabled it to become the book of all mankind.

And so the simple texts on stone, papyrus and earthenware have helped us, firstly, to a knowledge of the Sacred Volume on its linguistic side, and then, by that means, to no small understanding of its most distinguishing characteristics. A new ray of light falls on its history among the nations. The New Testament has become the Book of the Peoples, because it began by being the Book of the People.”<sup>15</sup>

Again Deissman says, “A Book from the Ancient East, and lit up by the light of the dawn—a book breathing the fragrance of the Galilean spring, and anon swept by the shipwrecking north-east tempest from the Mediterranean—a book of peasantry, fisherman, artisans, travellers by land and sea, fighters and martyrs; a book in cosmopolitan Greek with marks of Semitic origin—a book of the Imperial age, written at Antioch, Ephesus, Corinth, Rome—a book of pictures, miracles, and visions, a book of the village and the town, book of the people and the peoples—the New Testament, if regard be had to the inward side of things, is the Great Book, chief and singular of human souls. Because of psychical depth and breadth this book of the East is a book for both East and West, a book for humanity; a book ancient,

15 *Light from the Ancient East*, pp. 141-2.

but eternal. And because of the figure that images from the book—the Redeemer, accompanied by the multitude of the redeemed, blessing and consoling, exhorting and renewing, revealing himself anew to every generation of the weary and heavy laden and growing from century to century more great—the New Testament is the Book of life.”<sup>16</sup>

Undoubtedly we must allow in the above for the enthusiasm which naturally belongs to a discoverer, naturally also we will find other and deeper motives for New Testament life. Yet without doubt the new apprehension and the definite grounds for a truer interpretation of the Gospels and Epistles, furnished us by Drs. Deissman and Moulton and others is a real step in advance which ought to be recognized not only by scholars, but first of all by those whose business it is in life to be the preachers of the Gospel.

If now we have on the one hand the pure first written text of the New Testament, and on the other the key to unlock the language in which that writing is furnished us, *the next step to be taken in securing a proper interpretation can be none other than that of a true and vivid translation.* Each people taking the purely ascertained text and using the skilfully discovered principles of New Testament Greek interpretation, must carry that high and holy thought intended for men over into its own tongue with the greatest possible truth and vividness.

Truth requires and insures, between the final phrase of the translation and the Greek phrase of the original, an absolute quantitative and qualitative likeness of meaning. Vividness requires and insures that the truth thus conveyed shall breathe and move and kindle fire. This in a sort of undefined way the Church has always assented to, and it has therefore been in its best periods a translating Church. Naturally so, because first of new light on the text itself and again on account of the swift and continuous change in a living language vocabulary. An old translation in any really living language ceases to be an interpretation at all, or, as in many cases, rather a falsification than an interpretation. When we read “in the morning shall my prayer prevent thee,”<sup>17</sup> what does the average congregation think, if it

16 Light from the Ancient East, pp. 399-400.

17 Psalm 88:13.

thinks at all? Or are we not guilty of a sin of presumption when we solemnly affirm "I prevented the dawning of the morning?"<sup>18</sup>

Dare we not have a more dignified reading of Romans 6:6, which refers to our most sacred relationship with Christ, than we have by speaking of "our old man?" The student understands full well that it means old self or old nature. Then why not say so?

Shall we translate Hebrews 11:1, "Now faith is the *substance* of things hoped for, the *evidence* of things not seen," with King James, or "Now faith is the *assurance* of things hoped for, a *conviction* of things not seen," with the Revisers; or yet with the twentieth century New Testament, "Faith is the *realization* of things hoped for, the *proof* of things not seen?" For here we have a distinction with a difference. And we dare not be careless in this matter; not according to our theology. For it is the truth of God we are handling, that word "alive and energizing and sharper than any edged sword."

In truth, we must do to-day what the Church of the first centuries did for its age. What did it do? Just what it has always done since then when true to its spirit and alive to its mission and sound in psychology. That is, it conserved its religious influence by yielding its mother tongue of Aramaic and Greek and adopting the language of the people whom it wished to win. It dropped its Greek, but it saved its faith. It lost its Hebrew but it won its way to empire. What a pity that since then we have often been less far-seeing. Our splendid Scandinavian and German fathers have not always been able to see that the saving of the faith to their children and to the world is the royal privilege and task of the Church, and not the saving a language, however tender to the heart and efficient to the intellect that language may be. The Church of the Anti-Nicene fathers put first things first. They thought and fought for one thing, that men might confess with their lips the Word Incarnate, even the Lord Jesus, and believe in their hearts that God hath raised Him from the dead. To do this, they had to interpret the word written. Therefore the translation into Syriac in the East or Latin in the West or Coptic in Egypt. Those were great days in the Church. Its children were great messengers, for they were great transla-

tors and thus they kept the Word ever fresh in their hearts and habits. The Church's advance through the centuries is regularly paralleled by a constant, ceaseless translation of the Church's New Testament. Why? Merely because it is the Spirit's interpretation of the Word.

Therefore the necessity is upon us. The age feels it. The Temple Bible, the Readers Bible, the Twentieth Century New Testament and many more, either by fresh translation or wise and pointed paragraphing and allusion, seek to quicken New Testament interpretation. In German the "Probebibel" and new translations by Prof. B. Weisz, Profs. Keutsch and Weisz-sacker and Dr. Boehmer have followed one another in rapid succession. A new Spanish revision under way for seven years was completed last summer. And not only are more perfect revisions being made in the languages of the great nations, but the interpretation is still going on by many first translations. In 1910 a first translation of Matthew was made for the French Congo natives. St. Matthew and St. John were newly given to the natives of English New Guinea. St. John published for the tribes of New Caledonia, St. Luke for the New Hebrides and a complete New Testament for 3,000,000 natives of Abyssinia. All this in 1910. The interpretation is going on. And must go on to the end. Not only in printed translation but in those which each student makes for himself when with grammar and lexicon he sits down before his Greek New Testament (this applies also to the Hebrew Old Testament) and seeks the treasures from the depths, treasures thus personally his own.

And, while we do not take lightly to a new turn in some verse which we have learned long ago in the home circle at mother's knee or through father's admonition, yet they are necessities laid upon us. When a new cast is given to some old endeared Biblical phrase, it must come the first time with a distinct shock to the reader or hearer. It is the heart clinging to old word associations that makes the going away of an old translation, however defective it may be, a slow and really painful process. The introduction of a new and perhaps much better translation is thus only accomplished by the lapse of time and the recognition of its merit.

King James' Version, majestic in its gigantic advance over its English-speaking predecessors, must now give way, and

rightly, to revisions made to-day for men of to-day, who know the turns of their mother tongues' present phrasing and who also have the accumulations of several centuries of advanced knowledge in the field of those languages in which the Word of God first came to men.

What is true in English is equally so in German. The Luther translation, which fixed the German language in the hearts of Luther's people in a way unparalleled in history, has had to yield to quickening knowledge. When Luther sent forth from the presses his first edition in 1522, it may be said that he produced at once a nation, a language and a religious revolution. But he did not stop with one simple translation. He himself put out no fewer than eleven editions of the Bible, working at it up to the very year before his death. He knew its value to interpret. All these new translations succeeding one another are no loss, but rather a constant rebirth of the Word. It may be painful. But we must yield the words for the sake of the Word. To a Lutheran the material is always above the formal. The formal word is there only that the material Word may come to us, that the material Word may live in us.

After all, if we are unwilling to change our translation when new knowledge of the original is heaped upon us as it now is, and when the very life of our present language causes a constant change in the old meanings of words, then we are untrue to the very principle of the Reformation. Luther spent years to fit himself to put the Bible into the hands of the people so they could get its meaning.

If then we insist on an outworn translation made without access to the materials now in our hands, and made when our own languages were not really the tongues of to-day, then where is our superiority to the Roman Catholic? He prefers the Latin because it is a "holy language" and has the sanction of centuries of Church usage. We deny that claim and we plume ourselves on the Word in the tongue of the people, while at the same time we may use so antiquated a type of that tongue that our position differs from that of the Romanist not at all in principle, but only in degree.

We need always to have the logical courage of our Evangelical and Protestant convictions, and we want to and are under solemn obligation to keep our Bible fresh as language allows, so that God

may speak to the man who will be spoken to, with perfect clearness and a distinctness undulled by anything at all. All our words, we yield them all as a treasure trove to God that He may tell us of Christ and the cross, just as He wants to tell us. What better things can best words tell, than things which make the angels glad, the very things of God!

So, honoring the old translation, we go on to the new with an utter unreserve of faith and love, ever impelled by the Spirit of truth towards the perfect fulness of the Word of Life.<sup>19</sup>

But no translation, however excellent, can in all places give a transparently clear understanding of the truth to be conveyed. As a consequence, the text being found, its language understood, and a translation made, the student yet finds himself in constant quandary as he earnestly strives to know the truth intended. The Apostles understand this. Peter, speaking of his "Brother Paul" says, "Wherein are some things hard to be understood." (Most students will agree with Peter in this matter). *Therefore, unless one wants to wander after every will o' wisp, he must find principles through which he shall be at least fairly successful in making exact and clear that which else is obscure or ill defined.*

Our countless commentaries are proof that these principles have not been easily discovered. Merely to name the varied methods of interpretation is to pass through much dry and barren land.

There was the Rabbinical interpretation of the Jews which transposed words into letters and letters into figures, thus losing all life in mere arbitrary and fanciful procedure.

There is the allegorizing of the ancient Origen and the modern Swedenborg, which, disregarding absolutely the primary and ordinary meaning of words, attach to them all manner of fanciful speculation. To these interpreters the Word has a "natural," "spiritual" and "celestial" meaning. I fear we are too "natural" to understand the "celestial," too little "celestial" to quite get the value of the "natural."

Here is the Pietist and the Quaker, who, casting all rules to

19 Tressler—*Lutheran World*, March 22, 1911, "The Making of the Bible."

the winds, follow only "the inner light." Thus he finally becomes his own oracle, a lamp unto himself.

There is the Rationalistic method of accommodation, which aims finally to relegate into the background all the supernatural, counting it a mere accommodation to the credulity of the times.

Here is the speculative theory of comparative religions, which, by a negative criticism, divests the narrative of historical value and resolves our New Testament truth into a mere co-partnership with other faiths and unfaiths.

We may add to this last of failures also the Dogmatic method of understanding our New Testament, by which a doctrine takes first place and compels the warping of alleged proof-texts in order that they may fulfil a task which was never given them of the Holy Spirit. This method inverts the true order of things, making doctrine the foundation of the Word, instead of the Word the foundation of the doctrine. In this case we have not exegesis, but eisegesis, not a reading out but a reading into. Lutheran theology being so broadly scriptural in its basis, does not need this strained exegesis.

Lutheran theology rests on the Word of God and not the Word of God on Lutheran theology. Indeed in a very real sense the Reformation was based on New Testament interpretation and the right of the individual self-interpretation. If this gave rise to the undue ascendancy of reason, that has been once for all killed by Kant, "whose philosophy left reason impotent to judge of Scripture."<sup>20</sup>

A sanely spiritual analysis is the final solution. Technically we call it the grammatico-historical method. It puts us in the position of the writer and his auditors, asks us to live in their atmosphere of religious and secular thought and seeing the true picture puts us in possession of it. This demands both an intellectual and spiritual endowment. Specially that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of Glory, may give unto us a spirit of wisdom and revelation to the knowledge of Himself. Of course neither history nor grammar can ever fill the interpretative necessities of the New Testament. The Tübingen exegetes were quite correct when they insisted that there could be no proper Biblical interpretation apart from the historical founda-

20 Jacobs—N. T. Ex. Christian Progress.

tions. This is well enough in itself, but to it there should be added the supplementary principle that Scripture is really a spiritual message to the soul, a principle which in a one-sided way was urged by both Schleiermacher and Ritschl and which must ever be dominant in the Church.

These combined principles taken together with a proper modicum of confessional solidarity, have brought forth New Testament interpreters like Tholuck, Neander, Meyer the elder, Weiss, Godet, and now Sanday and Theodore Zahn.

These men find beneath the historico-grammatical principle a corollary directive for that principle that was discovered by the Great Reformer. "What assures me that the Scripture is the Word of God?" asks Luther. Answer, "God must say to thee or thine heart, 'this is God's Word else it is still undecided.' Thou must be as certain that it is the living Word of God as thou art certain that thou hearest and even more certain, for on this alone must thy conscience rest."<sup>21</sup> Here we have the interpretative witness of the Spirit.

Now what is the objective fact to which the Spirit witnesses in the Word, and which makes it the Word? Luther says, "dass es Christum treibt," that it deals with Christ. Dorner states that the deciding principle according to Luther, as is well known, is this, whether it is occupied with Christ.<sup>22</sup> Now this principle of Luther may not be final in answering the question of admission of books into the canon, for the New Testament canon is settled and is not the matter of our discussion, but this principle of Luther's certainly is final and normative as a principle of interpretation. It is this: "What is the Scripture's message of Christ?"

"Herein agree," says Luther, "all the genuine Holy Books, that they all teach and exhibit Christ. This indeed is the right manner to test all books, if one sees whether or not they present Christ. For all Scriptures witnesses to Christ (Romans 3:21) and St. Paul will know nothing but Christ."

If thus we may consider Christ as the center in determining what goes into the canon, undoubtedly Christ must be the center in the determination of the ultimate principle of that which is to

21 *The Bible, its Origin and Nature*, Dodds, p. 39.

22 *History of Protestant Theology*, Vol. I, p. 251.

be deduced from Scripture. This principle is a perfectly safe one and has nothing in common with that now somewhat out-worn cry, "back to Christ," the purpose of which is merely to eliminate the Apostles and their substantiation of Jesus as Lord. For we know that a real "Charisma" was given these same Apostles that they might officially reveal and interpret Christ. So that Paul could say, "I have the mind of Christ."<sup>23</sup> They thus indeed fulfilled in name the promise "Lo I am with you alway."

Yet when all these processes which have been indicated are seen and their varying principles of New Testament interpretation uncovered, it yet remains true that the Word is greater than any and all. The Word of God is not bound. The chief force of it is not as an authority determining our belief, but as a vital power "restoring the soul."

So for a true interpretation we need to be strengthened with might by His Spirit through the Word. The Word is not merely the words. But through the words Christ is to be made and is made manifest. He then is the successful interpreter of the New Testament who with an intelligent apprehension of the wise plans of procedure initiated by godly men of the past and present, can by personal assurance make men to know Him Whose Spirit quickeneth through the Word.

*Springfield, Ohio.*

<sup>23</sup> I Cor. 6:18.

#### ARTICLE V.

### THE LANGUAGE PROBLEM IN NEW TESTAMENT TIMES.

BY CHARLES W. SUPER, LL.D.

Until near the close of the nineteenth century many students of the New Testament held the opinion that it was originally written in an esoteric or sacred language understood by the initiated alone. While this might have been true of the Epistles it is not easy to see how it could be applicable to the Gospels as they were addressed quite as much to non-Christians as to Christians. Christ came to call, not the righteous, but sinners to repentance. When He began His ministry He had no disciples. Language is spoken and written to be understood. It implies not merely utterance but comprehension. Saint Paul had a clear perception of this fact. It is evident from what he wrote in the fourteenth chapter of First Corinthians that there was a controversy among those addressed about the language that should be used in preaching. He says: "What good shall I do, if I come to you and speak in tongues unless my words convey some revelation, or knowledge, or take some form of preaching or teaching?" "There is, for instance, a number of different languages in the world; and not one of them fails to convey a meaning. If however, I do not happen to know the language I shall be a foreigner to those who speak it, and they will be foreigners to me." The Corinth that Saint Paul knew was only about a hundred years old. It had been rebuilt by Caesar and settled by Roman veterans and the sons of freedmen. But there was likewise a strong Greek element among the inhabitants, and many other nations were represented. As is always the case with a heterogeneous population, its reputation in the matter of morals was very bad. There was, however, a vigorous Christian community in the city early in the first century. It is probable that the controversy referred to by the apostle was between those who spoke Latin and those whose native language was Greek. The Greeks always exhibited a marked aversion to learning any other tongue. The epistle does not decide which language shall

be used in worship; but it insists that it shall be conducted in an orderly manner. The words spoken shall be such as conduce to edification. There must be no strife or confusion. That Paul was deeply interested in the Corinthian Church is evident from the fact that his two letters taken together are the longest that he wrote and contain the most minute directions for recent converts.

The importance of being understood was strikingly exemplified by the rise of some of the minor, chiefly Methodist, sects, in Pennsylvania at the close of the eighteenth century. The preachers of the parent denomination used the English language, while the Lutherans and Reformed employed the High German. Dr. William Nast is regarded as the founder of German Methodism and he did not emigrate to America until 1828. There were many persons who did not understand the one language at all and the other but imperfectly. It was among this class of people that the United Brethren and the Evangelical Association was formed. Otterbein was an educated man. It is doubtful whether he ever intended to separate from the Church of which he was a minister. But events took their own course. Many of these early preachers were illiterate, but they were in earnest. By their zeal and self-denial they made many converts. Few people will listen to preaching which they do not understand. It must come down to their intellectual level, if it is to make an impression. When a religion consists of mere ritual and ceremony like the orthodox Russian the language used makes no difference. It is not expected to influence anyone's conduct. Protestants have generally taken their religion too seriously to be satisfied with mere formalism. The effect produced upon many Pennsylvania Germans was amusingly illustrated in a case that came under my personal observation. In the winter of '60-1 I was teaching a country school in Juniata county. It came to pass that a native German preached in my school-house one Sunday. He necessarily spoke in High German. After the service one of his auditors remarked to a group of men of whom I was one that the speaker used such poor German as to make it difficult for him to be understood. This man simply exposed his ignorance; but he represented the point of view from which many persons regarded the services of the Church. To produce any effect on such people and to provide

them with spiritual food it was absolutely necessary to use the only dialect they could understand. Although most of them were fairly familiar with the phraseology of Luther's Bible the practical application of its truths had to be made in a language that came closer to them if it was to produce any effect. It grates harshly on the ears of an educated man to hear any language "murdered" in its grammar and its pronunciation; but the number of persons who suffered from this cause in this country a century ago, so far as the German was concerned were a small minority.

The conditions in the entire eastern world from the time of Alexander's conquests until well on to Mohammed's time seem to have been without a parallel either before or since. It is probable that most of the peasants used their native dialect. In the cities and towns this may also have been true to some extent. But in addition a great many persons must have known Greek besides. Most of the cities in Samaria were virtually Greek. In Lystra the crowd used the Lycaonian tongue when they cried out that the gods had come down to them in the likeness of men. Yet it is noteworthy that they called them by the Greek names Zeus and Hermes, although this may be a translation into terms the reader could understand. The Latin inscription on the cross was doubtless a mere recognition of the Roman official language. If it had been intended solely for information the other two would have been sufficient. The well known historian Flavius Josephus, was born in Jerusalem about A. D. 37. He did not learn Greek in boyhood; but the fact that he half apologizes for the omission is evidence that his case was unusual. He does not seem to have been outside of Judea before he was twenty-six by which time he knew Greek. Nor was he ever in any country where this tongue was native unless we consider Alexandria such a one. He tells us that he wrote his "Wars of the Jews" in his native Aramean, but immediately translated it into Greek with competent assistance. It is probable that a native aided him in matter of style. At any rate his Greek is irreproachable. The Roman educator, Quintilian, who was a contemporary of Josephus spent all his life in Rome. He recommends that his young countrymen be taught Greek systematically before Latin. Diodorus, surnamed the Sicilian from the land of his birth, flourished in the first half of the second cen-

tury. Greek was still the language of his native city although it had long been incorporated into the Roman empire. The future historian, however, learned Latin in early life so that he became hardly less proficient in it than in Greek. When he set himself to write his history of Rome in the preparation of which he had spent many years he chose Greek as the medium although the Roman empire at the time embraced virtually the entire known world. Still more remarkable is the case of the emperor Marcus Aurelius. He was a Roman of the Romans, born in the imperial city and a member of an illustrious family. He is not known to have been on Greek soil during his whole life. It is the usual experience of men that their most secret thoughts, their communings with self, take shape in the tongue of their childhood, because they are generally more familiar with it than with any of later acquisition. The philosopher-emperor does not record his meditations in the official speech of his native land, but in Greek. He evidently felt that through this medium his inner consciousness most truly revealed itself, although his countryman, Cicero, had taught Latin to speak eloquently and felicitously the language of philosophy and morals. One more case of a similar nature will suffice here where many might be cited. Dion Cassius was born in Bithynia about A. D. 150. He became a Roman official and later a senator. He conducted legal pleadings in Rome for many years and must have been hardly less familiar with the Latin language and its literature, by that time far from being considerable, than with Greek. Yet he wrote his extensive Roman history in the latter language.

There are several points of similarity between the career of the two modern standard translations of the Bible and the originals of the New Testament. But there are also important differences. In a sense Luther was the creator of the New High German. He himself tells us how he proceeded. However, as the language of the German chancellery dealt chiefly with political affairs it must have furnished him with the form rather than the substance of the speech he employed. Many of his terms evidently come from some other source. His translation, like the Greek of the New Testament, became the basis on which subsequent theological discussion in the vernacular was built up. The Romish Church, however, from the first persistently refused to recognize it. Although the Septuagint was thoroughly famil-

iar to the writers of the New Testament, it did not provide its entire vocabulary. Neither the Septuagint nor the New Testament exhibits the same unity of style that is so marked a characteristic of both the German and English translations. Luther appears in almost every verse of the former and the entire work bears the stamp of his overpowering personality. When we consider the magnitude of the undertaking and the obstacles to be overcome the conviction is forced upon us that we have here the most remarkable achievement in the annals of literature. Luther's education like that of his coadjutors was conducted almost entirely in the Latin language; and while he never wrote it with elegance he was fluent in it with tongue and pen. The unique merits of his work become particularly evident when we remember that until the appearance of Lessing, Germany can not be said to have produced another writer who had at command all the resources of the German tongue while Latin continued to be the language of scholarship long after his time. At the beginning of the sixteenth century there were neither grammars, nor dictionaries, nor commentaries, nor other helps worthy of the name for the study of either Greek or Hebrew. The printed page so closely resembled manuscript as to be hardly distinguishable from it. The Erasmian text was almost the only circumstance that was favorable to the translator. In view of these difficulties and of others that might be enumerated the wonder is not that Luther made mistakes but rather that he made so few. On the other hand, the English language was fully formed before King James' translators entered upon their task. Besides, the Latin never had the vogue in Great Britain which it attained in Germany, and the translators had several good models for their version. That there were so many men engaged upon the work was a drawback. In view of this fact it is a good deal of an enigma how they attained such a remarkable unity of style, a characteristic that is almost always lacking in works that are due to collaboration. It has recently been maintained with some show of reason that the translators turned over their product to Sir Francis Bacon, the greatest intellectual force of his time and that he revised it from beginning to end.

There are some hundreds of words in the Septuagint that had not previously been written down by anyone, and there are many in the New Testament that appear for the first time. They were

doubtless in common use. When we ask where they came from we have no answer. Children learn to talk from their early associates, who in turn learned in the same way, and so on nobody knows how far back. All languages were at first only spoken. In the time of Christ there were very few written languages; at present there are not many. When Wulfila, about A. D. 380, undertook to translate the Bible into the oldest dialect of the German now known he had not only to reduce his mother tongue to writing but even to invent an alphabet. Many people speak one or more languages without being able to write, and sometimes more correctly than those who have acquired the art. It is not necessarily a sign of a narrow intellect if one has a limited vocabulary. Illiterates make use of one word in different senses where an educated man employs several. Our familiar vocable *make* is current in more than a hundred different significations. There are less than nine thousand words in the Hebrew Bible including proper names. What a variety of matter it deals with and how many different thoughts it expresses, often with the minutest shades of meaning! It gives us history, prophecy, laws, proverbs, prayer and praise. It is plain that both the Seventy and the writers of the New Testament used some words in a sense which they did not have in the classical authors. They were spiritualized and applied to specific conditions; but the general structure of the language is the same.

We have in the Latin word *testa* a familiar instance of the process by which a word that was originally considered vulgar passed into reputable speech and displaced its patrician brother. It means a "pitcher, jug, or any similar vessel of baked ware." It was also used to designate a potsherd, and still later was applied to the skull. At the next stage of the evolutionary process it came to be employed to designate not only the skull but the head, and *caput*, the proper term, was disused altogether. Hence we find it in some form in nearly all the Romance languages taking the place of this word. When accordingly an Italian says "testa," or a Frenchman "tete," unless he is acquainted with the history of the term, he is not aware that it was originally no more respectable than our "calabash" sometimes playfully said of the head. At the present time no one hesitates to employ the word "pluck"; in fact it could not be easily dispensed with. Yet in 1827 Sir Walter Scott apologized "or

writing it because it was a "blackguardly word." *Noddle* is now eschewed as low. In old English, however, it occurs frequently to designate the back part of the head or the head as a whole. There are at least seven hundred words in the authorized version of the Bible that are now regarded as obsolete, or have a different meaning from what they had three hundred years ago. For most of these others have been substituted in recent versions.

The ancient Greeks like the Jew were a roving people; perhaps more so. Owing to this fact Greece was more thinly populated during the first Christian centuries, if not earlier, than when it was free. Both Greece and Palestine were small countries; both were infertile; neither was capable of supporting the increasing population, to say nothing of the frequent and devastating wars that drove the inhabitants abroad. Sometimes victorious autocrats forcibly expelled the residents of a place or transplanted them at will to another. The Greeks however, differed in one important respect from the Jews. When the latter migrated it was generally by families so that wherever they settled they founded new homes. On the contrary family life hardly existed among the Greeks. The able-bodied men often sold their services as mercenaries to the highest bidder leaving their wives and children at home. The Jews considered themselves a peculiar people, as did the Greeks, but in a different sense. The latter did not try to proselyte. Their pre-eminence was a matter of birth; a man could not be a Greek unless he was to the manner born. The Jews tried to make proselytes. Christ testified to their zeal in this regard, but its effects were of more than doubtful value. With the former nationality was the important factor; with the latter, religion. The Greeks were less bigoted than the Jews. That many of the first Christians were Greek is evident from their names as reported in the New Testament and elsewhere. There does not seem to have been among the church fathers a single Jew. The Jews were the chief enemies of the new religion. The Greeks were inquisitive, keen-witted and tolerant. When anything new was brought before them they wanted to examine it; if a new doctrine, to hear it discussed. On the moral side their ideas were very lax. The story of the woman taken in adultery, found in Luke and John, illustrates the Jewish attitude of mind toward the class to which

she belonged. Most of the Greeks were concerned with private immorality only in so far as it led to public scandal.

It is now admitted that a knowledge of Modern Greek is an important aid to a comprehension of that of the New Testament. I may here call attention to a custom of long standing that still prevails in Greece. In the lexicon of Mitsotakis the words are marked "written" and "colloquial," by which designation the author means that the latter do not belong to good usage, that is, usage sanctioned by a self-constituted literary aristocracy. On some pages of the volume more words are marked colloquial than are marked written. Here we have undoubtedly the same principle of selection and exclusion that prevailed more than two thousand years ago, a principle that is, moreover, recognized to a greater or less extent in all languages. When W. C. Bryant was in charge of *The New York Evening Post* he kept hung up in the editorial room a list of words numbering about sixty which writers and reporters were forbidden to use. Most authors have an antipathy to certain words and phrases and never employ them. The Greek and Roman purists went further and carefully avoided all words not found in the standard literature, thus ignoring the well known fact that living languages are in a constant process of change. The New Testament writers betray no knowledge whatever of the classical writers; yet they knew Greek well. We are perhaps not even justified to infer that the terms used by some and not by others are localisms. They were probably an integral part of the current speech and simply did not happen to come into the mind of the writer, or were not necessary for what he had to say. The classical Greek, for example has no word for *will*. The concept implied in the term can be expressed, but it must be done by means of a phrase. The New Testament uses *thelema* frequently and *thesis* once. These words are correctly formed from a genuine Greek root.

What has been said above of Wulfila is true in an eminent degree of the Homeric poems, except with this difference: the latter embrace a vocabulary of more than eight thousand words, perhaps the entire Greek language of their time, while of the Gothic Bible only about three thousand words have been preserved, as most of the translation has been lost. They were not written down until long after they were composed, but transmitted orally from generation to generation. Greek is a com-

paratively pure language and therefore different from all modern languages, their vocabulary being in a continual process of enlargement from loan-words. In the New Testament, besides the proper names, there is not over a score of words borrowed from the Hebrew; such was the marvellous resourcefulness of the Greek. When called upon to set forth the new doctrines it was fully adequate to the task. The rapid spread of the Greek from very early times was owing to its merit, to the circumstance that it bore a message the people wanted to hear. Its dissemination was not due to its being the bearer of a new religion like the Arabic; nor to its being the official language of a strong government like the Latin. Government by Greeks was everywhere a failure. Neither did their religion have a priesthood to whose interest it was to conserve the language that embodied its "sacred oracles." It was a noble tongue and the depository of all human knowledge for many centuries.

Although the Jews of the Diaspora kept in touch with their co-religionists in Jerusalem, they forgot their language to a considerable extent in the course of time. Wherever they went they usually found that the Greek had preceded them. In order to provide a bond that should hold together the widely scattered communities a succession of scholars turned the Old Testament into Greek between 330 and 150 B. C. It has already been mentioned that the citations from the Old Testament found in the New are from their version. But as these citations are not literal, it is evident that they were made from memory and addressed to persons who were familiar with it. Manuscripts were not often in private hands. The case of Philo the Alexandrian Jew is particularly illuminating. He spent his entire life trying to make the Gentile world, but particularly the Greeks, familiar with the religion of his people. He seems to have had a good deal of influence on John's gospel, as the Logos-doctrine of the two writers has many points of similarity. Yet it is doubtful whether he fully understood the Old Testament in the original. So far as any influence upon the Greeks is concerned Philo's labors were in vain. To a Greek trained in the classical authors the style of the Septuagint was a serious drawback. One does not need to be a profound Greek scholar to be able to recognize its defective character as a translation. It is not only inaccurate, but the diction is harsh, sometimes even to uncouthness.

Although there is some difference in the merit of its different parts, it is generally conceded that none of the translations were made by native Greeks. That the Pentateuch ranks highest in literary merit is not to be wondered at since a plain narrative presents few difficulties. That the Prophecies and the Psalms stand lowest was to be expected owing to the extreme difficulty of translating from one language into another the highly figurative imagery in which poetry and especially the poetry of the Bible is expressed. Everybody knows that most persons, without being very familiar with a foreign language, will prefer to read its masterpieces in the original rather than trust to a translation, even when they feel incompetent to make a translation themselves. Yet many Jews trusted to the work of the Seventy to be the bearer of the religion of which some of them cherished the original texts with such scrupulous care.

Our knowledge of New Testament Greek has gradually been becoming more thorough by reason of the better acquaintance with the language of the era in which it was written, made possible by the discovery of numerous inscriptions of all kinds that have within recent years been unearthed in the East with almost startling rapidity. For a number of years past nearly every day has brought to light some new evidence. Then too the gradual development of Modern Greek out of the Koine or common tongue of the olden time has for a score of years been studied by competent scholars. It is not too much to say that the next generation will be in position to comprehend the social conditions of the first Christian centuries with a completeness that would have been considered impossible half a century ago.

*Athens, Ohio.*

## ARTICLE VI.

THE MINISTER AND MODERN THOUGHT.<sup>1</sup>

BY REV. EDWIN HEYL DELK, D.D.

## A STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM.

I am glad that you have phrased my subject as you have. To have asked me to speak as a theologian on modern thought would have imposed a technical and professional task beyond my powers. The theologian must not only indicate the content and significance of any science and discipline as related to theology; he must know the processes and the technique of such sciences in order to properly value and schematize the whole religious problem. The preacher has just as important, but a more modest intellectual problem in the discovery of what the scientist, philosopher and historian have made sure in modern belief, and in the use of the accepted materials as the background and the atmosphere of all thinking and preaching. He must know the few large conclusions of modern thought and so relate them to the fundamental and permanent elements of religion that his preaching shall be vital and addressed to his contemporaries in education and culture. The minister may be no less a student, but he need not be so much a technical scholar as the theologian in order to fulfil his function.

The minister must do his work in his own age. He can not preach to past generations, nor can he make his appeal to men of the future. He is to be a herald in his own times. Not to know, then, what *his* age is thinking, its concerns, its interests in religion, theology, science and social philosophy; its beliefs concerning Biblical criticism, comparative religion, the ethical teachings of Jesus and the application of Christian morality to the economic regime, is to live in an intellectual vacuum so far as influencing one's contemporaries is concerned. Not to be influenced by these contemporary points of view is to lose connection and vital touch with one's age. Of course one can go on

<sup>1</sup> Address delivered to the students of the Theological Seminary at Gettysburg.

grinding away at the thought—problems and investigations of a past century. There are doubtless dogmas and controversial questions of confessionalism that can be debated to the end of time, but they are not the inspiring, immediate, vital problems of the modern scholar and leader in religious life. Such absorption and isolation of interest sweep one out of the main current of present day problems and leave the student stranded on the bank of a once vigorous stream.

To deny that modern thought has any new truths to offer is to deny the presence and leadership of God in thought and life. It is a kind of atheism. The gradual unfolding of truth, the progressive discoveries in astronomy, chemistry and biology, the patient investigations in anthropology and primitive beliefs, the gradual realization of democracy, the world-wide religious movements tending toward fraternity and the federation of the forces of Christendom are as real revelations of truth and the ways of God as the promulgation of the Mosaic law on Sinai or the Acts of the Apostles.

May I venture to say, in all courtesy, that the three years you spend in a seminary is a time largely separating you from the real, busy, contemporaneous world of thought and action. It is one of the limitations of many of our American seminaries, in distinction from foreign theological schools, that ours are out of touch with our universities and university life. What is gained by our privacy of study and concentration of curriculum is lost in breadth and contact with the thought and activities of a great modern university and with men of other professional studies. It is peculiarly important, then, for us to keep informed, through literature, at least, as to the assured knowledge and beliefs of all those disciplines which modify theological systems.

Modern thought, it is true, has no significance or standing save as it roots itself in older thought. A belief is not true simply because it is modern; but on the other hand a belief is not true because it is ancient. Conservation and progress are both essential notes in the scholarly temper. To be wholly either a conservative or a progressive is to fly wide of the mark of a healthful development in thought and life. The conservative temper is needed to hold fast to those assured truths which are of unquestioned worth in society, science and theology; but the progressive or radical temper is just as important, for it goes to

the root of things and lays bare the new truths which have been discovered in the investigation of literature, history and life. In one sense there is nothing new under the sun; in another sense all things are new by reason of the modern point of view of the abiding truths. The modern doctrine of evolution was *speculatively* anticipated and held by the ancients. Anaximander, Plato and Aristotle among the Greeks; Augustein, Erigena, Berns and Cusa in the Medieval period of history; Descartes, Leibnitz and Herder in modern philosophy; Kant, Schelling and Hegel, each in his own way believed in a development from lower to higher forms of the physical, social, institutional world. But it was by *intuition* not by *ascertained* facts that they reached their point of view. The practice of historical criticism is as old as Biblical study. Astruc, Eichorn, Colenso were higher critics long before the term was coined by modern scholarship. The Christian consciousness based on Christian experience, all through the later Middle Ages was made a point of departure in the valuation of Church dogma. Schleiermacher a hundred years ago made his immortal contribution toward such a theological system. The significance of comparative religions was recognized as early as the eighteenth century by du Perron. Max Müller in the nineteenth century gave us the famed translation of those Eastern Scriptures which afforded us the first bases of comparison, in English, with Christian thought. The social problems which bulk so large to-day in applied Christianity are as old as Plato's *Republic* and Sir Thomas Moore's *Utopia*. It is the further sifting, revaluation and additional knowledge which the modern scholar has brought to these older beliefs which present the problem of theology in a new light.

I wish to have you avoid a common misunderstanding on the part of the reactionist in theology. We must make clear the distinction between the fundamental material of theology and the contributory factors in the interpretation of the basal facts of Christianity. The primal Christian faith in God as the creative holy Person, the universal Father of mankind; in man as a sinful and severed child of God, capable of response to the Father's redeeming love; the incarnation of God in Jesus Christ, the Redeemer of the world; the establishment and propagation of the Kingdom of God among all men; the gift of eternal life to all those who receive Christ as Saviour and Lord; and

the endless and heavenly life to be enjoyed after death by all His faithful servants—these cardinal and permanent beliefs of the Christian creed are inviolable and untouched by any and all modern interpretations of reverent and assured criticism. But as to the *method* and duration of the creative process; the origin of man's sinful nature; the nature of the union of the divine and human in the person of our Lord, the exact *theory* of the atonement wrought by Jesus Christ; and the character of the eternal reward meted out to various men—modern thought through science, historical criticism, philosophy and ethics has a modifying and illuminating word to say. The central objects of our faith remain, but a different interpretation of them has been forced upon us by the researches and conclusions of scholars in the various realms of thought.

There is another distinction which must be kept in mind in order to think clearly and avoid unnecessary contention with men who have not moved with the progress of intellectual and moral life. Men have confused the *source* of authority in religion with the *seats* of authority in religion. There is but one source of authority in religion—God. But He has given a threefold expression and commission to human life in the revelation of religious truth. He has revealed Himself in nature and in history. That revelation has come to us through men, in a Book, or books to be more accurate, which record His visitations and will for mankind; He has revealed Himself in individual consciences and experiences, some of which do not appear in a canonized group of writings, and he has revealed Himself in a religious society—the Church to whose authority He has committed the primal Christian truths and through whose communal life He has spoken His will. A clearer and fuller explication of these seats of religious authority will be given later, but it is essential in this initial chapter of our discussion to present this distinction and put ourselves in the proper attitude towards those who claim infallibility in all things—for a Church, a Book, or an individual Christian experience. God only is properly true and infallible. It is almost needless to point out that any denominational confession must be justified on other grounds than its antiquity or correspondence with the point of view of its age. The wise and humble framers of our Confession recognized that they could only formulate their "testimony"

of faith for their own age, and in good Protestant fashion bequeathed the right to coming generations to restate the Christian truths as the later age might see them. Confessions are not "the Gospel." The Bible is not "the Gospel," but contains "the Gospel." We insist upon our Protestant heritage of free investigation of the Scriptures in the light of all modern knowledge. Luther's was not the end, but the beginning of liberty in the application of history, reason, and Christian experience to the interpretation of the primal truths of our holy faith.

Let us consider some of those results of modern investigation which we should at least know, though some may refuse to apply them to our earlier theology.

#### EVOLUTION AND ITS IMPLICATIONS.

The first contributive factor in the interpretation of theology is our knowledge of nature. Let us be open minded and candid and we shall see that every theology unconsciously accepted the known science of its day—the prevailing world-view of phenomena, and incorporated it into its scheme of religious thought and writing. It would require too much space to illustrate this generalization, but from the earliest religious writing until now the contemporary knowledge of nature and man has formed the background, but not the substance of theology. Theology then must necessarily be modified in its form of expression by that knowledge of nature furnished by the scientific belief of the age. The earlier conceptions of the method of creation, the dualistic force in nature, the nature of man, have all undergone changes in the history of theological science. The unitary Nature of the force and method of creation by which God works and reveals Himself has modified all theology which shall persist and claim the allegiance of modernly educated men.

One has but to recall the earlier cosmogonies of Babylon and Assyria, the early Semitic modifications of the Assyrio-Babylonian traditions, and these Hebrew transformations in our New Testament idea of the universe to see how influential the gradual discovery of the facts concerning the earth's structure, growth and relation to the solar system has been in giving the setting to the permanent truths concerning God, the creation of worlds and man. The transition from the Ptolemaic to the Copernican

theory of the universe was the most momentous shift of scientific belief. When men came to believe that our earth was not the center of the universe, was not a flat plane around which sun and stars revolved, that the heavens were not a curved dome with windows through which the rain poured, that there was not an abode of the dead below the earth's surface, and that there were various superimposed stages above the sky reaching up to a throne, the background of belief in the creation method was changed. Not only the theologians but the scientists of that transition period of thought bitterly opposed the new view. But now we accept the new knowledge as a part of our theology. The later contributions concerning the limitless reach of space in which our universe floats, and the endlessness of time in which God has been at work, and is at work, in the perfecting of His world-plan have contributed mightily in the modification of our ideas of creation and providence. No longer do we think of the creation process as covering only six ordinary days, we do not base our chronology on Bishop Usher's computation as to the age of the human family. What is true in the sphere of astronomy and geology is true also in the spheres of biology and anthropology. The Hebrew tradition of how man was made has also been modified by later scientific research. What La Place, Kepler and Lyell did for us in astronomy and geology, Lamarck, the elder Darwin and Malthus began in biology and anthropology. The intuitions and guesses of the old philosophers and naturalists were subject to the rigid investigation, first of Wallace and Charles Darwin who simultaneously published the results of their studies on the origin of species. Darwin in 1859 gave to the world that book which laid the substantial foundation for all the later work for the theory of organic evolution. Evolution and Darwinism are not one and the same thing. Darwin, Lamarck, Wallace, Mendel, Weisman and De Vries and other contemporary investigators have offered varied explanations of the forces and factors of organic evolution, but however much they may differ in emphasis of the factors, they all agree upon a belief in a general advance in animal life by the transmutation of species, by reason of resident forces, acting upon environment and reacted upon in turn by the external conditions. Out of this "struggle for existence" came the fittest to survive. It is true that this

theory was once but a hypothesis. Every scientific truth was once held as a mere hypothesis. The belief in organic evolution, including the appearance of man, for the overwhelming majority of scientific men has passed out of the stage of hypothesis and has become the *working theory* of science. To quote a name here and there of some lonely man of eccentric or conspicuous character as opposed to the evolutionary theory of descent does not disprove our main contention that the theory of evolution is now accepted by the overwhelming majority of scientists whose opinions are worth anything on such a subject. Prof. Kellogg in his "Darwinism To-Day" has fairly and fully presented the objections of the one or two first-class biologists who still are looking for another explanation of how the various species have arrived in the order of animal life. It must be remembered that the men holding this belief in organic evolution vary in their interpretation of the physical factors and processes. There are found men holding varied philosophical beliefs, theists, materialists, idealists, Christians and agnostics who are evolutionists. The so-called "resident forces" include for many men a spiritual, vital, directive force in the group of agencies. Wallace and Le Conte are positive in their declaration that without a great, original, immanent first cause which has planned and now directs and energizes the whole procedure, biology can offer no rational or sufficient explanation of evolution. But just now we are not discussing the full explanation of the theory but its world-wide acceptance as a world-fact with which the theologian and preacher of to-day must reckon and adapt. A careful reading of such articles on evolution as appear in the new edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*—the most authoritative work in the realm of general knowledge, and the article on evolution in the *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia of Religious Knowledge*—the best known and most widely used work in the modern minister's reference library, will convince any unprejudiced mind that the theory is here to stay and is unquestioned by the group of editors selecting representative specialists in the various sections of thought. As another concrete proof of the universal acceptance of the theory among men who count in biology, I offer this fact: that, so far as I can learn from a wide sent questionnaire, there is not a college or university of the first-class in our country, or any European

country, where the theory is not either taught in course or is assumed in all teaching. Here is a typical answer I received from President David Starr Jordan, LL.D., of Leland Stanford University, one of the leading biologists of the United States: "There is no question as to the fact of evolution, the derivation of existing forms of life from earlier and different forms through natural processes. There is much question as to the relative value of the factors involved—mostly these four—heredity, variation, selection and segregation: especially the third." In reply to my second question: "Do you know of any first-rate universities or colleges where the theory is not taught?" he says, "No, there is none. A large number have special courses on the subject." He refers to Kellogg's *Darwinism To-Day* and Thomson's *Heredity* as the best two books for an up-to-date and popular explication of the theory. It would weary my hearers to quote from other men, holding commanding positions in university life, who are fully committed to a belief in evolution as the only rational explanation of the rise and progress of animal life. Wallace's latest book on "The World of Life" is the best popular expression of a theistic interpretation of the theory. Here the preacher is brought face to face with an undeniable situation. What will he do? What has the average theologian and preacher done in the past? I regret to say he has usually fought every advance in science, sought to minimize its significance, or played the part of the obscurantist while younger men convinced of the truth have become alienated from theology and the Church. This breach between the university and some theological seminaries is the most patent factor in deterring many of our best students from entering the ministry. Evolution, so long as we understand it to be God's *method* of creation, is as much Christian as the older belief in the instantaneous creation of man out of nothing or the dust of the earth. Prof. George Parke Fisher, one of the most conservative of Christian apologists writes in his new edition of "Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief," p. 444: "No theory of evolution clashes with the fundamental ideas of the Bible as long as it is not denied that there *is* a human species, and that man is distinguished from the lower animals by attributes which we know he possesses. Whether the first of human kind were created outright, or as the second narrative in Genesis represents it, were formed out of inorganic material, out of the

dust of the ground, or were generated by inferior organized beings, through a metamorphosis of germs, or some other forces,—these questions, as they are indifferent to theism, so they are indifferent as regards the *substance* of Biblical teaching. It is only when, in the name of science, the attempt is made to smuggle in a materialistic philosophy, that the essential ideas of the Bible are contradicted."

The real problem before us is to see how this doctrine of evolution must be related to the permanent elements in Christianity if we are to have a theology which shall command the respect of modern scholars and the informed public.

Theology proper is in most happy correspondence with the basal necessity of a theistic conception of evolution. Deism, on the one hand, places God in an attitude of transcendence which practically leaves nature to the operation of secondary, or natural, causes only. Pantheism, on the other hand, so identifies the being of God with nature that all distinction is lost in an impersonal imminence which nullifies all personality in God and man. Evolution as rationally conceived calls for a spiritual, personal, vitalizing, directing intelligence which is forever working and perfecting its creation. This being we call God. It is a remarkable fact that one of the most commanding present-day philosophers, Bergson, in his *Creative Evolution*, comes to practically this conclusion, though he stops short of designating the super-conscious power—God. St. Paul lends himself to this imminent activity of God in the principle expressed by his profound words: "In Him we live, and move, and have our being;" God "is in all, through all and above all."

As touching theology it gives us a vaster and more impressive scheme of development. The process is a vital unfolding in its main historical current of a goal realized in the individual man, the human race, and the Kingdom of God. It was this aspect of the evolutionary process which John Fiske, in his "Destiny of Man," set forth with such commanding skill.

The influence of the evolutionary theory upon anthropology is the point which will require the most delicate adjustment. This paper is not the place to develop any of these constructive adaptations of evolution to traditional theology but it would be disingenuous to avoid the evident implication which springs out of the new belief of the method of creation of man to the tradi-

tional interpretation of Genesis. If man's ascent was from a lower order of animal life, then the story of "the fall of man," as interpreted by theologians of the pre-evolutionary epoch, must undergo revision. Without relinquishing any of the sinfulness of sin, or even the doctrine of original sin, the so-called "fall of man" is a theory which must be re-examined both from an exegetical and philosophical stand-point. "The fall," on a careful examination of the opening chapters of Genesis, is by no means what it was currently supposed to be. It was rather the emergence of an innocent but ignorant creature into the full light of moral vision and ethical determination. It was the conscious, willful choice of a lower animal desire as over against a fuller communion with and obedience to the divine will speaking in the conscience of the emancipated man. For an exegetical and theological interpretation of this newer point of view, I urge upon my reader a candid study of a great book—"The Christian Doctrine of Man" by H. Wheeler Robinson (T. and T. Clark). How sin and the curse of sin entered human life is not identical with the *fact* of sin, or even the doctrine of "total depravity."

As touching the supernatural note in theology, President Garvie has this to say in substance in his article on *Miracles* in the latest edition of *The Encyclopedia Britannica*: "The doctrine of Evolution instead of increasing the difficulty of conceiving the possibility of miracles decreases it; for it presents to us the universe as an uncompleted process, and one in which there is no absolute continuity of the phenomenal or perceptible side; for life and mind are inexplicable by their physical antecedents, and there is not only room for, but need of, the divine initiative, a creative as well as conservative co-operation of God with nature."

As related to the Incarnation, the theory of Evolution is in strict accord with the Christian conception. The Incarnation is that fresh and unique irruption of the divine life of the Godhead into human history which is personalized in Jesus Christ. For a full and illuminating explication of this idea, I refer to "*The Ascent of Christ*," by Griffith Jones, and the short but suggestive paragraph at the close of the article on Evolution in the *New Schaff-Herzog Encyclopedia*. It is too soon even for a master mind to attempt the formulation of a complete Christian theology in the light of Evolution. Indeed I see that it is easy to overestimate its possible and necessary modification

of traditional theology, but that some constructive minds are called to this task is beyond question. One great, controlling idea it has stimulated in all theological as well as philosophical thinking, i. e., the immanence of God in the whole continuous and endless creative process. It has corrected that conception of God which separates Him from an active entrance into all human nature life. It has broken down a false dualism—the barrier between the divine and the human. It has shown us that a kindred life, a common life, a spiritual life, forever builds the human and divine; that there is ultimately but one spiritual nature—in man, sinful, repentant, aspiring, redeemed; in God, holy, constant, loving, self-sacrificial, forever cleansing and lifting humanity into communion and likeness to Himself.

#### HISTORICAL CRITICISM AND THE BIBLE.

Historical Criticism, no less than science and the philosophy based on the discovered facts of nature and anthropology, must be reckoned with if the modern teacher hopes to be a guide in the twentieth century. The inductive method applied to Biblical studies is inevitable. Just as the *a priori* method used in the study of nature has been superseded by a first hand study of the facts, so the facts of scriptural history, authorship, date of writing—must be studied not from the standpoint of authority, or what we think they ought to be, but as what they really were and are. The inductive method which was applied in geology, astronomy, anthropology and general history is now applied to all literature and religious expression. It is no longer a matter of choice; it has become inevitable to the modern mind trained in university life and the scholar's habit.

To confuse historical criticism as a *method* of biblical investigation with the *results* announced by certain higher critics would be a wrong to truth and the uninformed public. I have no patience with those speculative, naturalistic critics of the Protestant camp, or those ultra-Modernists of the Roman communion who, carried away by some personal, subjective, fantastic theory of literary origins, tear to shreds the genuine and authentic deliverances of prophets and evangelists. But, on the other hand, I have no more sympathy with those timid literalists, holding to some mechanical theory of inspiration, who will not enter into a

free and frank study of the various books of the Bible themselves, and seek to prevent others from entering into the kingdoms of light. Such men are infidel to the Protestant principle. They are quite as much foes of the Bible and theology as the iconoclasts they attack. The material for aid is all around us. Reverent scholarship has been at work for a quarter of a century doing constructive work in Biblical criticism. There is now spread before not only our preachers but also our laymen the results of such biblical study. It is not only in the great religious encyclopedias, such as the *Biblica, Hastings, The New Schaff-Herzog*, but in the one volume editions of the same publishers, that the materials and results of modern criticism are brought to the consideration of every religious reader. Our ambitious and conscientious Sunday School teachers do not restrict themselves to denominational "lesson-helps" in the study of the Bible. They find in the appendices of their "Teachers Bible," in current religious literature, in modern preaching the material and attitude which sets them to thinking upon the fundamental problems of the authorship, the character, the purpose, the meaning, the time of writing and the relation of one sacred book to another. The writer or teacher who ignores this free and frank investigation of the Scriptures can not be a guide in our day and is likely to prove an obscurantist where he should be a leader in all truth. My own conception of Higher Criticism as related to the fundamental truths of Christianity I have tried to state in my little book *Three Vital Problems*.

There are critics and critics. With the philosophic presuppositions and results of some higher critics I am at widest variance. I find that many of the names of our great Lutheran writers and scholars of Germany are used to bolster up a reactionary attitude by a few American protagonists of the let-alone policy—a policy which Lutheran masters abroad utterly repudiate. Whether it is ignorance or fear which causes these fiery apologists to misrepresent the position of such men as Zahn, Seeberg, Beth, Grutzmacher, Hauck and Ihmels, I do not know, If these men do not practice the method of historical criticism as applied to theology, the Bible, Church History and Symbolics, then they have no method at all. To say that none of these great conservative masters do not professedly or by implication write from an evolutionary, inductive, psychological point of view

is to confess one's failure to grasp the whole background and the canons of their dialectic. Seeberg is typical of the group. He writes in the preface to his work on the history of doctrines: "Nor is it to be forgotten, finally, that Dogma is perpetually subject to ecclesiastical and theological interpretation, which proposes the *forms* suitable to each age, which can and do express the ancient *content* in the new forms, and which furthermore seizes upon and preserves the religious experience peculiar to its own age in the harmony of the ancient faith." In the foot note to this paragraph he says "This is in some sense true of the valuable thoughts of nearly all the leading theologians of the last century, e. g., Schleirmacher, Ritschl, Hofman, Frank." As for the general position of these men, Seeberg gives recognition to every science under the sun (see his "The Fundamental Truths of the Christian Religion.") He accepts various conclusions of historical criticism, and his teaching on the Godhead has been regarded by able theologians as Unitarian, or at least as a form of Modalism. Zahn accepts and uses all the canons of historical criticism, though with results different from Harnack's. Ihmel's chief work is on Christian certainty which presupposes recognition of Christian experience, and he utilizes the results of historical criticism. Grutzmacher, a "modern positive," does the same thing, though his emphasis on Christian experience is perhaps less than Ihmels. Beth, like Grutzmacher, is a disciple of Seeberg; his chief work is on evolution, which he favors, and he is the ablest theologian in Germany in the natural sciences, fitted as no other is, to discuss the relations of theology to science. It is well for us to know that there are such writers and to read their works. But the truth is that some of them have been overpraised as theologians and thinkers. In my humble judgment Seeberg has produced nothing in theology which excels Fairbairn's *The Place of Christ in Modern Theology*, and his *Philosophy of Religion*. In the technique, material, style, and mental poise of English and American scholars we find as great, and as sure group of guides in purely theological writing as is afforded by any country.

There are certain accertained facts resultant from historical criticism which are generally accepted and which have modified theology. First, I would place the phenomenon presented by the action and reaction of the contemporaneous beliefs of the nations

with which Israel came in contact in her historical and theological development. On the whole she protected the cardinal beliefs in God, righteousness, sin, forgiveness and Messiahship from pollution. But that her writers adapted myth, and legend and allegory to her own ends; that her knowledge of the nature, character and will of God was progressive; that there was a struggling advance in moral ideals and practice, that the ideas of immortality, Satanic power, demonology and sacrificial cults were partly an inheritance from other peoples, in the common teaching of every modern writer on Jewish history and thought. Secondly, We must reckon with "The Documentary Theory" in Old and New Testament literature. It is a twice told tale that no longer do scholars attribute the writing of the Pentateuch to Moses. That much of the material may have been furnished by him is probable. But that the early chapters of Genesis, the traditional date of much of the legislation and the Temple cults, the description of Moses' death are divided from both earlier and later sources than was at first supposed is now self evident to every informed reader of biblical criticism. Modern research has made plain that there are at least three stages of Old Testament history which vary in character and historic accuracy. We find in the first chapter of Genesis early traditions of creation, either from Babylonian or prehistoric Semitic tribes adapted to the monotheistic belief of Israel. The ages described were marked by myth, allegory and primitive ideas as to the method of creation and the origin and distribution of tribes and languages. The second period—the patriarchal was bathed in an atmosphere of legend. The core of the stories was historic, but the note of legend and romance gave an idyllic and patriotic halo to the early patriarchal life of Israel. Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, were actual personages, but their biographies move in the glow of an heroic idealism. From the time of Israel's settlement in Cana the gathering of historical data for religious purposes began. The art of writing had been known for a thousand years before in Babylonia, but it is sheer presumption to say that definite written records were kept of the patriarchal or early period of Israel's history. Every later century added definiteness to the sacred writings. True, we can never hope to clearly demonstrate the various sources which were utilized by the writers and redactors of the Old Testament,

but the readjustment of place and date and author does not destroy the value and significance of Old Testament teaching for the student of Christian theology.

In New Testament criticism the documentary theory has now its place. This is not the occasion to go into an explication of the priority of Mark's gospel, the core of Hebrew or Aramaic logia preceding and incorporated in Matthew's gospel, nor the sources mentioned by Luke in making up his report of the words and doings of our Lord. That the oracular and dictation theory of writing has disappeared and that the method of the historian's careful compilation from tradition and earlier documents has succeeded to the earlier theory of compilation goes almost without saying. The note of individualism is so strong in the synoptic writers that no theory of verbal inspiration is longer tenable. It is now clearly seen that St. John's gospel makes a different approach to the facts of Christ's life from that of the synoptic writers. History is not John's primary motive in reporting the words and deeds of Jesus. He gives us a theological interpretation of the facts, the words and person of our Lord. He acknowledges that he writes with a distinct theological purpose—"these are written that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." Two memorable accounts of Socrates have come down to us. Xenophon in his *Memorabillia* recites the bare, outward facts and sententious sayings of the great teacher. Plato in his dialogues expounds the core of Socrates' teaching and suffuses the person of his Master with his own beautiful idealism. Something of the same interpretive character, the words and life of Christ receive in the writing of His devoted disciple, the author of the fourth gospel. Xenophon is no truer than Plato, but without the latter we should never have had the true portrait of Socrates. There is always a metaphysical, a supernatural background to every personality, and only a John with a soul akin to that of his Lord could rightly estimate the person of Christ. It is because the higher criticism has made clearer just such distinctions, limitations, insights and predictions in St. John, St. Paul, St. James, that theology owes an unspeakable debt to modern scholarship. It has set theology free from that tyrannous literalism and false idea of inspiration which made all attempts at the adjustment of theology with modern thought in history, science, and philosophy either impious or

revolutionary. It has taught us that the language of the Scriptures is fluid, pictorial and contemporary. It is true that we are not now in a position to project finished systems of theology, as writers of an earlier age did when they unhesitatingly used texts from any and all parts of the Bible to sustain the most abstruse doctrines of theology. The cocksureness of systems has been humbled in the light of the various values and meanings of the texts. The *a priori* or speculative method of theology has been greatly modified by the modern point of view. Prof Borden P. Bowne in his *Studies in Christianity*, says: "There will always be need of theology, but its field will be very much restricted in the future. The elaborate deductive constructions of the past will be abandoned as outrunning our data, and our knowledge, if not our faculties. But the theologian will always have the function of formulating our Christian ideas and adjusting them to the current stage of thought and knowledge. In this way our ideas will fit harmoniously into the existing intellectual and social order, and will have their proper influence. But the results thus reached are never to be stiffened into an orthodoxy which if any man hold not he shall without doubt perish everlasting, or made into an article of the standing or falling of the faith. These results are relative to conditions. They have varied greatly in the past; they will vary greatly in the future. In few, if any departments of theology has finality of conception been reached. For instance, the problem of eschatology has hardly been rationalized or moralized at all, and awaits its adequate discussion. This, however, does not mean that everything is at sea, or even that anything of much importance is at sea; for still and all the while the Church believes in God the Father Almighty, in the Son, our Lord, in the Holy Ghost, the forgiveness of sins, in the Kingdom of God on Earth, and the life everlasting; and this is all that is essential for faith or practice."

### III. CHRISTIAN CONSCIOUSNESS.

The third requisite for effective preaching is Christian experience. Without this first hand consciousness of Christian truth, trust and triumph, a man remains a mere echo or sounding-board of religion. Christian consciousness has its intellectual, its emotional and its ethical forms. Never has the mind as mind

been so thoroughly studied as to-day. Not only do the objective facts of science, history and literature furnish the phenomena and material of belief, but the processes of knowing, the nature of the emotions, the will, and the religious instincts are a component part of our beliefs and faith. There is a revealing source—God. There are *truths* to be imparted—by history and prophetic voice. There is a *receiving and apprehending mind*—mankind saved and unsaved. It is perfectly apparent that man's mind conditions the reception of the revealed truth. A mind in a low stage of development, a mind which has a half knowledge of the world in which it lives, a mind basely tainted with greed and lust of all kinds, a mind untouched by the grace of God, disturbs the revealed truth and can not become a true medium through which the divine nature can speak and shine. And further, the truth so apprehended and conditioned does not become a real possession and effective force until it is translated into personal experience. It is at this point that most men fail in the religious life—pre-eminently required by the preachers of the Gospel. The human is the channel of divine communication. God's revelation has been progressive because man has slowly been prepared for the reception of more sublime spiritual and moral truth, but in every age it is truth revealed in man and appropriated by man. This gives Christian experience which is the final and commanding authority in our lives. The Bible, the Church and the Reason are all channels or seats of authority in religion. The crux in the theological debate has been the false exaltation of one or another of these seats of authority. Certainly the final appeal in religious belief can not rest on any one of these factors divorced from the others. The Christian truths existed and were taught before the various gospels and epistles were written. The Church rejected, and accepted, sometimes arbitrarily, the various treatises that make up our present Bible, and she has always insisted upon interpreting the book which she has canonized. But in the final analysis the Biblical truths and the Church's Creeds and Confessions must be made real and vital by their personal revaluation and be experienced as religious facts before they command and compel the soul to submission and action. Knowledge must be made faith. The outward authority must become an inward authority before the reason and the heart are afame

with light and holy zeal. It is from this inner spiritual citadel of the mind, conscience and heart that the questions of revelation, inspiration, conversion, regeneration and the eternal life receive their final interpretation, and ultimate illumination. The final appeal is made to the Christian consciousness. The attempt to corral all of Christian experience under the head of Ritschianism is futile and displays a most pitiable ignorance of the history of theology. All through the mediaeval and modern period of theological history, though the infallibility of Bible and Church has been preached, there have always stood clear-eyed and honest champions of the necessity and right of Christian experience to interpret and enforce the truths of our holy faith. Schleirmacher stands first among our Protestant theologians in the explication of this point of view.

Christian experience does not claim to be the sole authority. It declares it is dealing with objective and revealed truth. It is not mysticism, nor rationalism, but a vitalism, a spiritual vitalism that proves and weighs the truth by a life lived in and for God.

Christian experience is not isolated or individualistic to the point of excluding the communal experience. Here is where Martineau and his school of thinkers break from the great teachers of the historic Church. Personal experience, just because it is personal, must be supplemented and balanced by other personal experiences in order to group the *whole* human spiritual experience. Here appears the value of the Church and the general creed. But however valuable the communal experience, it is still true that truth to become commanding must be judged, accepted and lived in a person in order to command and enthrall his soul. It is this fact which makes theology a progressive science and religion a life.

#### IV. COMPARATIVE RELIGION.

The time is not far past when the great ethnic faiths were looked upon not only as false religions but were considered inventions of the devil. Later they were accounted for as the work of crafty, ambitious priests desirous of gain and of keeping the people in subjection. Still more recently they were looked upon as degenerate forms of earlier Biblical revelations. Now all these

conceptions have been left behind by modern students of the ethnic faiths. Religion is recognized as an universal instinct and possession. Man is incurably religious. God has not left any people without some measure of spiritual power and truth. It is said he who knows but one language knows none. If this is true in the study of a language, it is doubly true in the study and appreciation of Christianity. Christianity and the ethnic faiths possess in common a characteristic which illuminates and confirms the value of religion in general and makes Christianity to shine forth as the world's supreme faith. The world's great religions find their first common possession in the fact of evil and sin. No two may interpret the phenomena alike, but all recognize that in life there is a great open sore. The cry of moral misery and limitation and dissatisfaction arises over all the earth. The world is out of joint. Hatred, greed, evil-mindedness is the common stock in trade. The need of propitiation and sacrifice appears in all the higher forms of world-religions. From ancient Asia and Babylonian, from Confucian and Zororastrian, from Buddhist and Roman the pathetic smoke of altars and bleeding bodies proclaims the sense that sin calls for some sort of expiation.

The worship of some super-mundane power however vague, grotesque and autocratic appears in all religions above the grade of the lowest. The power may be merely malignant in character, it may be deficient in personality, it may indeed be revolting to our modern, ethical sense, but the sense of a first cause or causes is ingrained in the human mind and heart. In a lecture which has already transgressed the limits of your patience it is impossible and indeed unnecessary for me to characterize the various ethnic faiths. My purpose is simply to urge upon you the value of studying Christianity as related to the partial and imperfect faiths of other religions. Certain great differences are obvious. Confucianism presents a remarkable ethic without any attempt to postulate God. Brahmanism, which is practically pantheism, destroys the personality of God and man's supreme spiritual experience is lost in an unconscious Nirvana. Buddhism recognizes the woe, pain and evil of life, but has no plan of real redemption. Mazdeism makes the fight between good and evil an eternal conflict, with no conclusive triumph on the part of either of her dual gods of light and darkness. Mo-

hammedism is overloaded with fate—God is autocratic and aloof with no throb of fatherhood. The absence of any certainty that life has a permanent value is the canker at the heart of heathenism. Pessimism is the hidden note and unconscious attitude of all the faiths untouched by the Christian spirit. They are deficient in a sense of the higher world unity made possible by a belief in the universal fatherhood of God. Consequently the truth of the brotherhood of man is either veiled or becomes an impotent dream. Their great desideratum is a power to redeem from sin—a redemption of the individual and society accomplished by a divine incarnation. Christianity is the only religion of redemption. Jesus Christ is the unveiling of God, the holy, loving Father of all men. Jesus is the ideal man. Jesus is the empowering personality which gives to our holy faith its vital effectiveness. First through Jesus Christ has the value of every individual soul become manifest.

The recognition of these likenesses and differences between Christianity and the ethnic religions gives to the preacher and the foreign missionary the key to the understanding of and the method of approach to the mind and heart of the world's religions. Not with a crushing ridicule, but through an intelligent sympathy must we enter into a man's faith and seek to bring the fuller light of the glorious Gospel of Jesus Christ.

#### V. SOCIAL WELFARE AND THE KINGDOM.

Christianity has a social message. It contemplates a kingdom of God. It proposes a redemption of society and the state as well as the redemption of the individual. Christianity offers the power and a method of realizing the goal of the social philosopher and economist. The most illuminating sentence I know of in social philosophy are these words of John Stuart Mill; "The social problem of the future will be how to unite the greatest individual liberty of action with a common ownership in the raw material of the globe, and an equal participation of all in the benefits of combined labor." The first historical steps in securing liberty for the slave and serf of the classical and mediaeval period were the sense of personal worth, the gradual liberation from the thrall of a political and social impotence, the emergence of the proletariat into conscious struggle for place and power in the

State and the industrial solidarity of the world's workers. As political and social liberty were slowly acquired, a larger participation in industrial control became the goal of the leaders of the labor movement. The labor movement with its trades unions, Marxian Socialism, the co-operative and profit sharing program of economists, the great modern movement for the democratic control of government and the attempt to socialize all productive and distributive agencies of the State cries aloud for some ethical and religious power which will make possible the plans of the social philosophers. This situation is a fresh challenge to Christianity. As in each and every age the open-eyed disciples of the Master responded to the world's dominant cry for aid in the solution of common problems, so the leaders of our faith have been quick to set forth those principles and that spirit of Jesus which are for the healing and inspiration of the social movement. In our age the ethics of Jesus have been recovered. His moral teaching was overshadowed by theological discussions. No doubt the discussions and battles over strictly religious dogmas were inevitable and necessary in order to arrive at the limitations of theology, as well as at the essential Christian truths. Whatever praise or condemnation we are inclined to mete out to Harnack one great debt we owe him. In his showing of the accretions of Christianity through the Hellenization of dogmas, Roman institutionalism and the Lutheran additions of the thirteenth century he has worked back to and laid bare "The Gospel." He has shown that not only the Roman Catholic Church but Protestantism also in the seventeenth century, and groups in the various reform churches to this day, have placed *gnosis* above *pistis*. In not a few instances an orthodox rationalism has been the test of regularity rather than faith, i. e., trust in the divine Lord. From this thralldom of a benumbing confessionalism modern scholarship has led the open mind of the twentieth century into the enjoyment and power of the primitive, vital Gospel of Jesus Christ. Gnosis shall have its true place in the future but it will not usurp the place of *pistis*. We have seen by aid of the history of doctrines that the pure Word has been subject to philosophic and dogmatic forms of expression which have taken out of the realm of effective theology and preaching the original doctrines which express the permanent truths of Apostolic days. The present age's call and dilemma are not theological but social,

and woe be to the Church if she fails now to make application of the spirit and principles of Jesus Christ to modern industrial and social problems. The menace of Mormonism, the strife between labor and capital, the congested city with its poverty and vice and drunkenness, the false ethics of our Nietsches and Schopenhauers, the half-baked schemes of a materialistic socialism, the exasperating ostentation and power of plutocracy, legislative corruption and deadening secularism must be faced and conquered by a new race of Christian prophets and saints. We must not only proclaim the kingdom of God, but must insist upon the application of the tenets of that kingdom. The kingdom of heaven must first of all be within our leaders but they must hasten also to actualize, in an objective society—in commerce, in industry, in politics, in social life—the law of justice, love and brotherhood. The new democracy can only be made possible through education—a Christian education which has the personal, dynamic Christ of history and life as the transforming agent. No mere vision of truth in nature and man, or in Biblical studies, no contribution of Christian consciousness or comparative religion, no social theory or humanitarian devotion, alone or combined, work the miracle of a kingdom of heaven. Only the spirit and sacrificial life of Jesus Christ shining in the heart and guiding the battle for righteousness can or will usher in that age of equity, comfort, peace and joy which now fascinates the brain and faith of God's noblemen. The Church is not fully alive to this social service. Many men once satisfied in the Church have grown indifferent to her because her energies and program lag behind the age and its need. I wish in closing to echo the words of the Protestant Episcopal Bishop of Michigan:

"The religion of to-day has grown and expanded until it finds the walls of the home in which it was born too narrow and confining for its spirit. And it bursts out of doors into the open fields of intellectual research, moral welfare and social service, while the Church stays indoors, absorbed in the reek of her incense, the bustle of her rites and the preaching of her orthodoxies. \* \* \* \*

"There are multitudes of men and women to-day longing and seeking after a first-hand experience of the 'gospel as the power of God unto salvation.' They want a religion alive with the

sense of a living and present God, and therefore efficient in dealing with physical and moral evil, disease and sin. \* \* \* \*

"The Church is bound to become more hospitable to the new spirit of religion. She is already being more and more impregnated and possessed by the best mind of the age. She is relating herself here and there to the great movements and tides of the spirit. More and more prophets are heard in her pulpits, pleading for and proclaiming the larger righteousness of economic justice and social equity, as distinguished from the narrower righteousness of merely personal respectability, the righteousness of the kingdom as distinguished from the righteousness of the solitary individual. Brave spirits are steadily carrying her banner forward to the forefront of the real battle."

*Philadelphia, Pa.*

## ARTICLE VII.

THE DISCIPLINE AND WORSHIP OF THE CHURCH  
OF THE MIDDLE AGES.

BY REV. C. W. HEATHCOTE, S.T.D.

The Middle Ages present views of the Church which no other age has known. It was a period in the history of the Church in which phases and conditions were so varied as to make it unique in every particular.

It was a time when veneration and reverence for God were shown to a remarkable degree. The Church, however, laid too much stress on the externals of religious life. A religion based on externals could not bring about true repentance nor give the proper conception of duty and piety.

Later efforts were made by various leaders and writers of the Church to inculcate the idea of true piety, but they only met with partial success. The teachings of Bernard created intellectual and spiritual revivals and made a deep impression upon the Church, quickened the conscience and uplifted many people, but the Church never got away from the observance of externals.

The necessity of worshipping good angels was deeply impressed upon the people of this time. They were taught to fear Satan and his host of evil spirits. That demons brought misfortune, plagues, disease and suffering to the individual and community were the common views of the time. If the good angels were adored, the worshipper would be protected from the ravages of the evil powers. In time every village, chapel, church and cathedral had its tutelary angels which were worshipped and supplicated for help and blessing.

Good men and women were canonized as saints, and wonderful stories were elaborated setting forth their deeds of mercy. Miracles were attributed to angels and to saints. The relics of saints and martyrs were eagerly sought after and their possession imparted miraculous gifts. Each Church had its patron saint and collected as far as possible all the relics which belonged to that saint.

More devotion and homage were given to the Virgin Mary

than to any other saint. She was exalted and venerated because she was the Mother of the Christ, and recognized as the queen of the saints. She was praised in the hymns and highly exalted in the liturgical service. Charms, which were worn in her honor, were regarded as efficacious in warding off disease. Prayers were also said to her.

In urging the worship of saints and martyrs the Church was establishing more firmly her authority, power and influence over the minds of all classes of people.

The Church was rapidly becoming the recognized head not only of spiritual and also of temporal affairs. By the thirteenth century her power in temporal affairs was well nigh absolute. By her command kings were removed, nobles were punished and governmental policies were dictated. Rich and poor, the strong and weak alike, realized her absolute power. As a result of this power she developed a penitential system which was far-reaching in its effects. This system had its good as well as bad qualities. The Church, with such tremendous power, was able to work the penitential system with wonderful success. It had the tendency to keep down sin in a community, quickened the conscience, and encouraged fasting. However, it was soon seen that the penitential system did not inspire true religious ideals. The sale of indulgences brought freedom to the rich to do as they pleased.

To enforce such discipline as it deemed necessary, the Church established the systems of excommunication, the anathema and the interdict. To be excommunicated from the Church was considered the worst calamity which could possibly happen, and all made every effort to escape it. The anathema, which invariably accompanied excommunication, was also greatly feared. The interdict was a terrible mode of ecclesiastical discipline, which always accomplished its purpose. Kurtz says, "Till the interdict was removed, the Church bells were silent, worship was celebrated with closed doors, and only priests, beggars and children under two years of age, received at burial the rites of the Church. Thus a whole district was made responsible for the sin committed or tolerated in it, and seldom did the people long brook this painful state of affairs. Yet all this while ecclesiastical discipline, which Petrus Lombardus had described as *contritio cordis*

*confessio oris and satisfactio operis*, continually declined in moral earnestness."

As the Church continued to pursue this religious policy the spirit of false religion was developed. Excommunication on the one hand and indulgences on the other showed the inconsistent policy of the Church. The effect of discipline, which was to be accomplished by excommunication, was undermined by the sale of indulgences.

It was seen during the Crusades what an illogical policy the Church pursued. Those who enrolled to fight in the Crusades, though they may have been guilty of the vilest crimes and consequently subject to the discipline of the Church, yet received so-called plenary indulgence which permitted them to go unpunished. Those who gave large sums of money toward the Crusade movements received special blessings and indulgences.

The continued sale of indulgences led to hypocrisy and falsity in worship. It was also one of the causes which brought about the Reformation.

The disciplinary policy of the Church was carried to such an extreme that "the ordeal" was instituted. It was a violent means of torture to test an individual's guilt or innocence. If he was able to endure the suffering and pain without a murmur he was judged innocent. The ordeals of fire and hot water became the common ways of detecting heresy, especially during the terrible Inquisition period.

The Church during this time used every means possible to advance its power in spiritual and temporal affairs throughout the world. The authorities at Rome were truly diplomatic in their dealings with the different kingdoms. The Church on the whole was very anxious to preserve peace and harmony among rulers and people so that its worship and religious development might not be hampered. The influence of the priests in this direction was powerful.

There were times when the papal authoritiees sanctioned war. They encouraged the Crusades as righteous wars against the Saracens, whom they considered heretics. The Church, which was the guiding and influential power of the Crusades, at their close found she held undisputed sway in the temporal affairs of Europe.

Though she exerted every influence to preserve peace and har-

mony among the various kingdoms of Europe, yet she never hesitated to incite nations to war to strengthen her position.

The Church laid much stress upon giving as an element of worship. It was taught that through self-sacrifice, merit would be attained. The rich established hospitals and monasteries throughout the land. The middle classes practiced self-denial in order to give to the poor. In the earlier days there was no organized forms or method of dispensing charity. To give systematically came very much later.

Those who gave large amounts for benevolence were promised by the Church that at death they would escape purgatory and enter at once into eternal bliss. Upon holidays large gifts were distributed to the poor, blind and helpless. Those who gave lavishly were lauded enthusiastically by the priests and the crowds.

This period was the great ritualistic age of the Church. The hymns and liturgies show the beauty and majesty of the ritual. The service was rendered in the Latin language, which was peculiarly adapted to it. So much stress was laid on the ritual side of the service that the preached word was crowded out. Sermons were only preached two or three times a year, usually on Christmas, Palm Sunday and Easter. The result was that the mind was impressed with the beauty, glory and pomp of the mass, but the soul was starved.

The fact that preaching was becoming a lost art among the priests of the Church alarmed the leaders of the period. Evils had arisen which the beautiful ritualistic service could not offset. The leaders of the Church realized that preaching had to be restored in order to create a healthy moral sentiment. In the latter part of the thirteenth and in the beginning of the fourteenth centuries there arose a new era in preaching. Much of the preaching previously and at this time was done in the Latin language, but this was ineffective as the majority of the people were unable to understand it. When the preaching was done in the language of the people it was appreciated by them. That the people were hungry for the gospel message was shown by the large numbers which attended the services. The strong and effective preachers of the age were those who preached plain, practical and simple sermons. The people were not interested

in theological controversies but delighted to hear the simple story of the Christ.

The revival of preaching, however, did not succeed in giving to the preached word the chief place in the service. The ritual remained the dominant factor. Many of the priests were unable to write sermons or to preach, and hence they laid great stress on the liturgical service. Yet there were many among the clergy who devoted their entire time to preaching and went about from place to place preaching the Word.

It was not until the Reformation was well under way that the preached Word was given the chief place in the service. This is the plan followed in the Protestant Church of the present time. Since the Reformation period regular preaching service has been established in the Catholic Church. The ritual is conducted and chanted in the Latin language and the sermons are preached in the vernacular, although the sermon does not receive the chief place in the service.

In order to intensify the disciplinary and worshipful life of the Church, seven sacraments were instituted as follows: baptism, confirmation, the Lord's Supper, penance, marriage, ordination and extreme unction.

Baptism was recognized as a sacrament of the utmost importance. Great stress was laid upon infant baptism. The Church held that the proper place to have the child baptized was the house of God. This sacrament was the seal of the new covenant. The Church authorities recognized it as a sacrament taking the place of circumcision. The Church councils sanctioned baptism as absolutely necessary for salvation. When the babe was baptized the priest baptized it into Church membership. The Church compelled the parents, through the authority of the sacrament, to have the children properly instructed and trained in the doctrines of the Church. They were required to have them taught as soon as possible the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, etc. They were required to send their children to the Church for instruction at an early age. This was the secret of the Church's power during the Middle Ages. It took care of the child, taught and trained it in the principles and doctrines of the Church, and it never departed from those teachings.

The sacrament of confirmation was greatly emphasized on ac-

count of the vows and disciplinary effects. It was administered when the child became twelve or fourteen years of age. Up to this time the child was being properly instructed and trained. The sacrament of confirmation brought the young into full membership in the Church.

A sacrament which brought manifold blessings to the recipient was the Lord's Supper. The view of the Lord's Supper which predominated during the Middle Ages was that of transubstantiation. Inasmuch as the Eucharist was regarded as highly efficacious in bringing blessing and in averting evil, the Church authorities made it compulsory on every member of the Church to partake of it.

The sacrament of penance occasioned the establishing of the confessional as one of the strong institutions of the Church. It continues thus to this day. The sacrament of penance gave the priest untold power. He had the right to forgive sins whether the confessor was in earnest or not. The secret of the whole system rested in good works and the outward observance of the laws of the Church. This viewpoint was another cause which led to the Reformation. According to reason and scripture no priest has the authority to forgive sins. When one makes a confession in a penitent spirit a minister of the Church of Christ and by His authority may declare the entire forgiveness of his sins in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. The sacrament of extreme unction was administered to the sick and dying and it was thought to bring special help to them. The Reformers rejected extreme unction as a sacrament, but urged every pastor to visit the sick and dying, and bring them the consolation and comfort of the Gospel.

The sacrament of ordination was a special function of the bishops. The modern Catholic Church continues to hold this view. In the Protestant Church ordination is not looked upon as a sacrament but as a sacred rite of the Church. The manner of administration varies in the Protestant Churches.

The Church of the Middle Ages strongly urged the members to marry. They believed the marriage state promoted happiness and the observance of higher moral standards. However, the clergy were not permitted to marry. The verdict of history shows that much immorality prevailed among the priests prior

to the Reformation and this was another cause which led to the Reformation.

In order to intensify the zeal and godly living of the worshipper, the torments, punishments, horrors and terrors of hell were magnified in a way unwarranted by Scripture.

The Church taught that souls which were not eternally damned went to Purgatory. It was claimed that souls could be prayed out of Purgatory, and people paid large sums of money in order that masses might be said for the deliverance of their souls from this abode into Heaven. Heaven was pointed out as the goal of the worshipper. It was recognized as the abode of the blessed. To attain it more stress was laid upon a religious life of externals, formalities and good works than upon faith, love, devotion, and service which are the essentials of true religious living.

*Philadelphia, Pa.*

## ARTICLE VIII.

## CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

I. IN ENGLISH. BY PROFESSOR J. A. SINGMASTER, D.D.

*The Harvard Theological Review* (July) opens with an article by the celebrated philosopher, Rudolph Eucken, of the University of Jena, on the question, "What is driving men to-day back to religion?" He sees a deep undercurrent of religious longing in the mighty tide of material progress and prosperity. "The demand is unmistakable for more depth of life and for the establishment of profounder inner connections than our visible existence affords. \* \* \* All the splendor of the external successes of civilization cannot hide the fact that it does not satisfy the whole man with his inner needs." "Again, men crave more love and more solidarity in the human race than modern civilization affords, and that, too, is driving men to religion." Since the present state of civilization is intolerable because of its mere human culture, "in all deeper souls to-day is stirring a demand for an inner uplift of human nature, for a new idealism. And this demand will necessarily have to seek an alliance with religion." The nature of religion Dr. Eucken does not define. He leaves the reader in suspense.

In the same Review, Dr. George Trumbull Ladd, of Yale University, discusses the question, "Is Faith in God Decadent?" He reviews the changes in theological conceptions which have taken place in recent times through the advances of science and philosophy, and concludes that the great fundamental truths pertaining to God and to man's immortality are still firmly fixed. But in spite of a new and improved conception of the Divine Being, there is not a corresponding faith in God as the Redeemer of humanity. The needs and desires of the present are obscuring the future and the unseen. Unrest possesses the world. "If we look the civilized world over, we may note everywhere a more or less clearly conscious apprehension of important and somewhat awful political and social changes, impending and not for long to be delayed. The faces of an incalculable host of human beings, some wan with hunger and disease, some pale with anger

or despair, some flushed with anger and hatred, some lighted with the dawning of a new intellectual and moral experience or with expectations of a coming victory, are seen gathering for a determined assault upon the political, economic, and social, and even upon the legal and religious forces that for nearly two thousand years have held the world of civilized men under their control. With enormously increased vigor and portent the lower and the lowest ranks of democracy are coming to the front in human affairs. Observers are dividing themselves in opinion as to the result into schools of optimism and pessimism, and, as to the method of dealing with the problems which this rise of the democracy creates, into schools of co-operation, of civilization, or of armed resistance to the very end. Some anticipate the vast improvement, and some the utter destruction of existing institutions, when Socialism succeeds—as it now seems destined to succeed—in carrying through its avowed plans. Some rely on education, some on the laws of that vague and uncertain thing called 'social science,' and some on the police and the army. Religion relies on God,—but not as an abstraction, or as a blind mechanism, or as an absentee spiritual force, but on a Living God, immanent in and operating through all the economic, political, and social forces for the redemption of mankind."

---

*The Princeton Theological Review* (July) has as its chief article a discussion of "The Church and the Social Question," by William Benton Greene, Jr., of Princeton. The Church must take one of three attitudes toward the social problems. First, some hold that the Church ought herself, as an institution to undertake to solve them. This is her mission. She should turn her preaching stations into social settlements, should go into politics, should initiate reform movements. Rauschenbusch, Macfarland, Reginald Campbell and others maintain this view. Second, some hold that, while normally the mission of the Church is individual and religious, she should meet the present social crisis by attempting practically what the first party proposes. "The ship is going down, and we must turn to—crew, passengers, officers, pilot, all,—and man the pumps." Third, some hold that the mission of the Church "is primarily and characteristically individual, and it is above all religions. It contemplates saving men from sin rather than society from poverty,

making them new creatures in Christ Jesus rather than surrounding them with opportunities for education and culture."

It is maintained that the more acute the social crisis the more earnestly "should the Church devote herself to her own special and spiritual mission to individuals. It is thus that she will best meet the crisis and redeem society and bring in the kingdom."

Our author ably defends the last or third position, which most of us believe to be the only tenable one. The following is a brief summary of the argument:

1. The transcendent importance of religion, whose chief function is to realize our consciousness of God. Not only does religion transcend all other interests in life; but all else depends on it—art, science, philosophy, morality. *The supreme need is a revival of religion, which shall elevate and transform the activities of men.*

2. The Church has no time for anything but its own immediate and specific objects. Its great business is to preach Christ as the world's hope. We are not to study science in order that we may understand Christ, but we are to study Christ that we may understand science. The opposition to the Church as the promoter of a supernatural remedy for sin is pronounced. It is held that she should no longer preach the gospel of the atonement and regeneration, but what Macfarland calls "the great gospel of Labor and the great gospel of Socialism and the gospel of Anti-Tuberculosis and the gospel of the Fraternal Orders."

3. The Church is disqualified for what is called social service, by the complexity and consequent difficulty of it. The problems of poverty, of labor and indeed every department of social science are exceedingly difficult, requiring the most exact knowledge and the most thorough training. In these days only a specialist can hope to compass any one subject or line of work. The theologian has his own particular task which leaves no time for other and equally difficult work.

4. History confirms the position that the Church should limit herself to her specific task. Up to the time of Constantine the Church as a society kept aloof from political and civic affairs, and was consequently spiritual and progressive. Under Constantine a radical change took place. The Church was lifted to the throne of empire. She became the reformer of society and ceased to be the regenerator. Before she became aware of it, the

Spirit had been grieved. Our Lord refused to deal with social, economic and political problems, except from a moral point of view.

5. The relation of the minister to social service may be summarized as follows:

a. "Movements for social reform" are to have his sympathy and intelligent support as an individual man and Christian; but he has not the time nor the expert knowledge to assume the leadership in such work. He will lose his pre-eminence as a minister if he give himself to anything that interferes with his specific work.

b. In the pulpit the minister should not allude to any merely economic question like the conduct of railroads by the State or by corporations. Concerning social questions he should discuss only the principles underlying them, "but he ought not to refer them to particular persons or movements," and should refrain from denunciation of men who do not see as he does.

c. "In the case of sins explicitly forbidden in the Bible, such as the social evil, drunkenness, extortion, the duty of the minister is clear and simple. He ought not to be any less direct and emphatic than the Word of God itself." Yet the minister must be constantly on his guard against becoming only or chiefly a reformer or agitator. Regeneration rather than reformation should be his aim. The Gospel rather than the Law should be the burden of his preaching.

---

"The Place of the Christian Minister in Organized Society" is the theme of an article in *The Reformed Church Review* (July) by the Rev. A. O. Reiter. The minister ought to have a specific place in society like every other man; but in these days of social unrest, he is expected to do nearly everything except what was once supposed to be his legitimate work. One wants him to be the conductor of a gymnasium, another wants him to provide a moving picture entertainment. Some good people have invented all kinds of guilds and leagues and societies for him to manage, and to keep alive. The minister himself is often too anxious to take up with every new fad, in order to galvanize a languishing congregation into new life. He has also failed to learn that a division of labor is the way of success in the commercial world, and, therefore, he tries to do everything himself.

In its primitive state society had few competent leaders, and consequently priest and prophet and later the minister combined in their respective offices many functions. But this is neither possible nor desirable any longer. The minister can no longer be a magistrate, a school teacher, and a physician as well as preacher for very obvious reasons. Why should he allow himself now to be overburdened, distracted and prematurely worn out by endeavoring to do things for which he is not fitted and which actual unfit him for the service which he ought to do.

"The one true sphere of the Christian minister is the Church." He must know God and men. Amid the fire and smoke of the world's maddening activities he must have a vision of God, and help men to keep alive a sense of his nearness. The pulpit is the minister's throne from which should go forth the mighty influence of the Gospel to mold every worthy cause and movement, and to inspire men to do their best in their respective callings in life.

He must not try to do everything that pertains to Christian activity. He cannot "serve tables" any more than the apostles could. And why should he, seeing that his work is more important and that there are many Stephens who can serve tables better than he?

---

*The Methodist Review* (July-August) has an article on "The Psychology of the Pulpit" from the pen of Prof. W. J. Davidson, of the Garrett Biblical Institute.

First, "The Task of the Pulpit" is very great, but often not realized by the preacher. The task lies partly in the *objective* of the pulpit. Its message must be delivered not for the sake of the subject, but for the sake of the object. This is "the redemption of society" and hence is world-wide. The preacher must not only seek to save men, but must save them that they may serve. To win men, the preacher must know men, and must learn to adapt his message to all classes. He must be a great student in order to understand what men are thinking about. His preaching ought to be thoughtful and filled with seminal ideas, but it must not lack the evangelistic tone. The task of the pulpit is also conditioned by what may be called "the method of the mystic pioneer." "He is to *feel* and *see* the Infinite."

Second. "The Bearing of Psychology on the work of the Pul-

pit" is most important. Psychology is fundamental and introductory to logic, esthetics, and ethics. "Psychology gives us estimates of fact; ethics, estimates of worth." Psychology is vitally related to theology because it must be verified in the preacher's own consciousness, in order to be effective.

---

In an introductory note to an article on "The organic unity of the Old Testament" by Dr. Thoelstra, the editor of *The Bibliotheca Sacra* (July), Dr. G. Frederick Wright says: "This lecture \* \* is but one of the many indications of the return of the Old Testament critics to the maintenance of conservative views. The critical views of Kuenen are no longer maintained by his successors at Leyden. The all-too-prevalent Wellhausen assumptions are being now more and more discredited in the Fatherland, and it is to be hoped that his British and American followers may have their eyes opened to the anachronism of still maintaining his views of the Pentateuch. To continue to impose them upon the Christian public as the incontrovertible results of scholarship is coming to be little less than criminal."

---

*The American Journal of Theology* (July) contains an article by Prof. T. G. Soares, of the University of Chicago, on "Practical Theology and Ministerial Efficiency" in which he lays down a large programme for the training of the future minister in the theological seminary. Practical theology is concerned in making a ministry efficient in three respects: (1) in the effective presentation of a spiritual message suited to the needs of the people and of the times in which the minister lives; (2) in the organization and administration of the Church in its wide and increasing activities; (3) in the leadership of the Church as an educational enterprise.

In respect to the first of these, the endeavor involves three elements of study: (a) the message; (b) the psychological study of humanistic presentation; (c) the technique of sermon preparation and delivery. The preacher must be taught that the message is to be religious. He must preach religion and that religion must be the religion which he himself experiences. He must be the exponent of religious conviction and the interpreter of religious life. All the great material of preaching is at his disposal, provided he can make it his own. In the presentation

of his convictions he must keep his hearers in mind, and must study and know them from a psychological point of view that he may compel them to hear, to feel, and to act. The technique of preparation has been already well worked out in our seminaries, while that of delivery should have been acquired at college. But as long as the latter is so generally wanting experts in public speaking should be secured to assist the professor of practical theology. It would be of great value to have an instructor personally visit the men in their student pastorates and help them on the basis of an observation of their actual procedure.

Church administration is the second great field of ministerial service. Beside the usual care of souls, the minister is to oversee the "thousand activities, clubs, societies," &c., &c., so that they may all be "touched and beautified by the spirit of religion." In some communities the Church must do everything that is done "for the better life of the community from cleaning the snow off the sidewalks to nursing babies, from helping the farmers raise better corn to opening the eyes of the people to the glory of art." Who is sufficient for these things? Some of these things can be learned in the seminary; but every student should have actual practice as assistant in a well-organized Church.

The leadership of the Church as an educational institution is the third great activity for which the minister is to be fitted. The Church is responsible for the religious education of its people, and the minister must be able to provide it either himself or through competent teachers. "The religious educator must know the process of the development of the psycho-physical organisms, the development of the moral, educational interests of childhood and youth, the real nature of the material of study, and of the activities and plays which he employs. He must know the experience of competent workers who have been experimenting in this field, and must then intelligently do his best to assist the educational process, and note as carefully as he may the results that seem to be possible of measurement."

---

In *The London Quarterly Review* (July) Principal Garvie makes some judicious observations in regard to "One World, One Gospel, and One Church." The World's Missionary Conference in Edinburgh in June 1910 and the First Universal Races Congress in July 1911 teach us two great truths. The latter tells us that mankind is one in nature, and ought to be one in moral

sentiment; the former tells us that this oneness can only be, and ought to be, in Christ. "Humanity is ceasing to be an abstraction, and is becoming a reality; the solidarity of humanity is proving itself not a phrase, but a fact." Exploration, business, commerce and multiplied other interests have brought the most distant parts of the world into close contact. No great event in any nation is without influence on the world. "The coal strike in Great Britain is being felt not only in European lands, but is affecting the commercial interests of Japan." A dispute concerning an African dependency may threaten the peace of the world.

The material conditions for a united humanity are already present, though the unity is hindered by prejudices. Science proves the physical unity of the race. Society is now being regarded as organic. Men must be mutually helpful. The most thoughtless and the most selfish can not ignore or evade the social problems. These great facts make for the favorable work of the Church in her mission to the world. The Church must add to the economic and moral sentiments now drawing the world together the religious sanction in order that there may be a true and lasting unity. "The quickest way of making mankind one is by offering all men one gospel, bringing all into one kingdom, joining all by a common faith to the one Savior and Lord. The missionary movement completes all these tendencies towards the solidarity of mankind."

But has the Church a universal Gospel to offer to all men? The Edinburgh Conference seems to give an affirmative answer. The ancient faiths and civilizations are being influenced by Christianity. Yet, on the other hand, the situation is full of peril. "If the other European influencees should get the start of the Christian, a great opportunity may be lost, from our human standpoint, even irretrievably lost. European science and philosophy may overthrow the native religions only to impose the darkness of materialism or agnosticism. European civilization may break up the moral order, and be powerless to offer any higher moral guidance. Japan is already realizing the danger of a morality lacking the inspiration of religion. If Confucianism loses its hold on China, without a more adequate moral code gaining control, who can conceive the moral chaos? The unrest in India among the educated youth indicates its need of a moral

idea vitalized by religion. \* \* \* What the whole world would be if the material resources and intellectual treasures of Europe were appropriated by other continents, Asia and Africa, without Christianity, who would dare to conjecture?

One problem in connection with evangelization is exercising the minds of the advocates of missions. Take it for granted that Christianity is the absolute religion; but are all the differences which have sprung up among the various sects amid the conditions of European society to be transplanted to Asia and Africa? The universal gospel of missions can not be adapted to all lands unless it be stripped of mere local and temporal forms in which Christian faith has been more often buried than enshrined. Nor will the universal gospel be reached while the Churches are divided.

But how is this unity to be realized? In Canada the Methodists and the Presbyterians have failed to agree as was hoped. In South Africa the union movement has failed utterly. The serious mistake is being made in endeavoring to arrive at uniformity instead of unity. "As a Congregationalist, the writer would urge that modern scholarship confirm the contention of Congregationalism that the Church of Christ is to be recognized in every local congregation, that for the essential functions of the Church it is complete in Christ's presence and operation by his Holy Spirit." Congregationalism in its inclusiveness and not in its exclusiveness, corresponds to New Testament teaching. The old name, Independency, gives a false and wrong emphasis. The individual congregation may not assert its rights against the claims of the universal Church. All congregations must find unity in love. "All organizations of the past have their justification, if they expressed the Church's life, and accomplished its tasks. To-day no polity can claim to be exclusively legitimate. Each has its value. \* \* The spirit still lives and works in the Christian Church." The Church must ever adapt itself to new conditions. "To maintain ancient traditions and venerable conventions is not fidelity to principle, but distrust of the guidance and guardianship of God's Spirit in man's progress, and so neglect of opportunity and failure in duty. So inspired and so adapting themselves, the Churches seem likely to maintain their variety. But that need be no hindrance to unity, if the spirit of Catholicity, based on the recognition of the one Church of Christ, the

spiritual body, in each and all congregations, becomes prevalent and dominant. Thus without the enforcement of a uniformity which would only produce further division, the one Church of Christ may advance with the one Gospel to the conquest of the one World for the Kingdom of God."

---

*The Hibbert Journal* (July) contains in an article on "Conformity and Veracity" an earnest plea from the Rev. E. W. Lummis, of Cambridge, Eng., concerning the restoration to the Church of England of all those who are now excluded from her ministry by the Act of Uniformity passed just 250 years ago. At that time about 2500 ministers were lost to the Church. The ground of their exclusion was their unwillingness to subscribe the new Paper Book, which many of them had had no opportunity of examining. They could not accept some things which they knew were in the new book, and hence their consciences would not allow them to remain. Mr. Lummis, who is probably "liberal" in his theology, would like to see the ban removed so that a large number who love the old Church may be able to work in her ministry.

There are three ways conceivable in which this may be done. "The first is a revision of the liturgy, and the concessions of a somewhat larger discretion than now exists in the omission of particular passages." "A second way would be the carrying into law of a declaratory act, carefully worded, to make clear that the recitation of the liturgy does not actually imply a personal avowal of belief in every statement it contains." "Thirdly, it might be possible to have these wasted men for the Church by establishing in the common sense of the Church itself a conviction that the words of her liturgy are not meant to declare any personal opinion, or to bind the intellect within a narrow hedge of doctrine; that their whole value lies in their appeal to faith, hope and love, those weightier matters, beside which doctrines and forms are idle things."

We venture the opinion that the common sense of the Church will do no such preposterous thing. Whatever remedy may be necessary, it will come by-and-by through the disestablishment.

---

In the same number of *The Hibbert Journal*, M. M. Pattison Muir, a Fellow of Cambridge, discusses "Dogma and Science" in quite an off-hand fashion declaring them to be irreconcilable.

"Theological method is scientific method standing on its head with its feet in the air. The two methods cannot be reconciled. Like right-handed and left-handed gloves, one cannot be superimposed on the other. We have seen some theologians vainly striving to draw right-handed gloves on their left hands." The author asserts that "theologians distil facts from dogmas. Men of science distil theories from facts." "Scientific method and theological method have nothing in common. Scientific theories and theological dogmas differ fundamentally in their meaning, their functions, their influence. \* \* To live in the world of theological dogmas is to live in a world of unrealities. The scientist welcomes change; the theologian dreads it.

This article is like all half-truths full of error. Theology is certainly a science in that it is a systematic classification of facts, many of which, however, are beyond the ken of physical science. To some men no facts exist beyond those which can be analyzed in a laboratory. The rejection of a divine revelation leaves men in darkness and to hardness of heart. The things of God are foolishness to them, because they must be spiritually discerned. They have no spiritual organ—faith—and hence in their blindness they cannot see the plan of grace.

II. IN GERMAN. BY PROFESSOR ABDEL ROSS WENTZ, A.M., B.D.

The tendency in all branches of the theological sciences is towards a clearer definition of issues. In every school of thought the investigation of details continues with unabated vigor, but the controversies among the schools are no longer waged over the minute details. The debates have come to center upon the broad, general lines of difference. This is a wholesome change from the conditions of the near past and has introduced a far more agreeable tone into the theological discussions of the present. Honest effort is being made at least to understand the point of view of the opponent. And not infrequently the discussions deal specifically with the difference of view-point rather than with the object viewed. The general differences among the schools are brought more clearly to the front, and the chief scene of battle is among the prolegomenary principles. This is due to the fact that men have come to realize more fully how large a part is played in all the processes and conclusions of the

investigators by the personal equation and the philosophical presuppositions. Perhaps we may look forward to the time when theological controversies shall be relegated entirely to the sphere of epistemology. This has long since been the case with dogmatic theology, and now in all the other branches of theological science there is an unmistakable tendency in the same direction.

Several recent productions in Old Testament branches of theological research may be regarded as decisive steps in the direction of clarifying the issues in that department. In the field of Old Testament Introduction there has been a highly instructive literary controversy during the past few months which will enable the unprejudiced student to judge impartially of the relative merits of the two leading schools in that sphere. The contest was short and dignified. The antagonists have operated not through pamphlets and articles but through books. They have not stopped at petty details but have reached fundamental principles. Their literary deposit is well worth the study of any one who wishes to inform himself about the general current of theological thought concerning the Old Testament.

It is a well-known fact among American readers that for a considerable number of years Professor Cornill's Introduction to the Old Testament has been the most widely read book on that subject, especially among university students. It has passed through six German editions and has long since been translated into English. When, therefore, in 1910 Professor Sellin of Rostock issued a book with the same title, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, Cornill regarded it as a challenge calling for action on his part. Accordingly early this year he published his "*Zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament*." This is a book almost as large as Sellin's *Einleitung* and consists of a critical negation of 26 views advocated by Sellin. This attack by Cornill did valuable service for Sellin in the way of securing a wide reading for his book. Nevertheless Sellin could not remain silent under Cornill's criticism and so he has replied with another book of the same title as Cornill's attack, "*Zur Einleitung in das Alte Testament*," and of nearly the same size. In these four books the student has the material for complete orientation upon all the important problems of the Old Testament, together with the latest arguments on both sides of each question.

Nothing is plainer from a study of this material than that the difference between Cornill and Sellin in their interpretation of details rest upon a fundamental difference in the principles which they employ, a fundamental difference in their conceptions of the course of Old Testament religion. At the same time this learned discussion of the experts can leave no doubt that Old Testament science is undergoing at present vast and important changes. Cornill is in rather strict accord with the Wellhausen conception of Israel's religious history, whereas Sellin speaks of this as "the old Wellhausen theory," and claims to have passed beyond that theory to a conception that is more in conformity with the facts, especially those of very recent discovery. For many years Cornill has been the chief interpreter of the Wellhausen theory, introducing and popularizing it among the students, and a whole large school of distinguished scholars has grown up about that theory. Now Sellin arises and stoutly insists that the Wellhausen construction rests upon a faulty philosophy, does not explain the facts, and is thoroughly antiquated. Is there any basis for such a claim? A general survey of the positions occupied by busy Old Testament scholars of to-day would seem to indicate that there are very good reasons for Sellin's claim.

Wellhausen's influence has practically ceased, and for two reasons. In the first place his conception of the course of Israel's religious history was based upon an antiquated philosophy of history. It is an open secret that the Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen method of Old Testament interpretation proceeded originally from Wilhelm Vatke. Now Vatke's Biblical Theology was published in 1835 and based entirely upon Hegel's philosophy. Wellhausen himself did not deny either his dependence upon Vatke or his Hegelianism. He insisted upon construing history so as to make it accord with the constant rhythm of thesis, antithesis, synthesis. And in this he has been followed by his chief disciples through the three and a half decades that have passed since the first appearance of his *Prolegomena*. Even Stade in his recent *Biblische Theologie des Alten Testaments*, (begun in 1905, second volume by A. Bertholet in 1911) takes as his fundamental idea the thought that the origin and content of Israel's religion can be traced entirely to their changing circumstances of locality and their growth in power. The

God of Israel is largely the outgrowth of Israel's struggle with the Canaanite deities. The demonism and fetishism of the "primitive religions" culminates in the Jehovah of David. This construction of Old Testament religion is purely the speculative evolutionism of Hegel's philosophy of history and has an exact parallel in the theory of New Testament history put forth by Baur and his Tübingen school half a century earlier. For more than thirty years now the Old Testament investigators have been operating with the problems suggested by the Wellhausen theory. And with what results?

The first problem which the scholars began to consider was the pivotal assertion of the Wellhausen school that the prophets of the eighth century, Amos, Hosea, Jeremiah, and so forth, were the real founders of Israel's religion and the originators of its body of law now written in the Pentateuch. More than two decades were given to the thorough investigation of this question: the relation of the eighth century prophets to Moses. A large and constantly increasing number of scholars engaged in defense of the view that these prophets made no pretense whatever of founding a *new* religion but regarded themselves simply as reformers who bore the commission to protest against the immoral and irreligious conditions of their times and to summon the people of their day *back* to the religion which had been established among them in the early history of their nation. The proofs for this view are to be found in such works as König, *Die Hauptprobleme der altisraelischen Religionsgeschichte* (1884); Orelli, *Die Urreligion Israels* (1885); Kittel, *Geschichte der Hebräer I* (1888); Oettli, *Der Kultus bei Amos und Hosea* (1895); Sellin, *Beiträge zur israelitischen und jüdischen Religionsgeschichte, Bd. I* (1896); Giesebrécht, *Die Geschichtlichkeit des Sinaibundes* (1901). The arguments gained weight with each new publication, for the evidence was cumulative. Gradually the disciples of Wellhausen began to realize their error. In his Old Testament Theology of 1905 Stade hints plainly at concession, and in 1907 Volz, one of the most energetic representatives of the Wellhausen ideas, changes front entirely and enters the lists for the Mosaic origin of Israelitish religion, *Mose. Ein Beitrag zur Untersuchung über die Ursprünge der israelitischen Religion*. Since then a large number of other scholars, among them Bäntschi, Stärk, Benzinger, and

even Gunkel and Gressman, have emancipated themselves entirely from Wellhausen's influence and have given up the evolutionistic construction of the history of Old Testament religion. So that we may to-day regard the historicity of Moses, the Mosaic authorship of the law, and its priority over the prophets of Judaism, as thoroughly established.

Having arrived at essential agreement as to the proper historical relation between Moses and the prophets, scholars have set about answering the question whether the beginnings of Israel's religion and cult can not be traced back scientifically beyond Moses to the patriarchs. Disciples of Wellhausen, such as Stade, Kautsch, and Marti, have insisted that the patriarchs shared the religion of the Semites in general, that they looked upon stones and trees, streams of water and holy hills, as the homes of special deities, and that they stood therefore upon the low stage of religion characterized by fetishism and polydemonism. Not only does this view overlook the undoubted fact that Abraham began a new religious epoch when he separated himself from his home and kindred for reasons of religion, but it may even be seriously questioned whether the "primitive peoples" and the Semites in general contemporaneous with Abraham occupied such a low stage of religious development as is here assigned them. This Ed. König points out rather emphatically in a recent article in *Die Reformation* entitled *Neuere Hauptschritte der alttestamentlichen Religionswissenschaft*. But this whole question concerning the religion of the patriarchs and the original form of Israel's religion still occupies a prominent place in the forefront of Old Testament investigations. A masterful effort at the solution of the problem in its various aspects is made by König in his *Geschichte der alttestamentlichen Religion*, 1912. König is a stout advocate of the view that Israel's worship of Jehovah originated with the patriarchs, not full-blown indeed, but at least in its essential elements of henotheism. And while there is as yet no general consensus of opinion among Old Testament scholars in favor of this view yet the constant trend of the conclusions is in that direction. Ethnology, archaeology, and textual criticism, are steadily leading us beyond the Wellhausen hypothesis.

For just this is the second reason why the influence of Wellhausen has ceased, the obverse side of his mistaken philosophic

presuppositions: his theory does not serve to explain the facts unearthed by recent investigations, especially by the excavations. No one can well deny the ingeniousness and relative justification of Wellhausen's criticism for his time. Critical acumen and a fine sense for the play of historical forces united with Wellhausen's brilliant powers of presentation to make him a leader among scholars and to commend his views on the course of Israel's history and on the age of Old Testament documents. But the inviting structure which he raised thirty years ago is thoroughly antiquated now. Our entire conception of the religious and cultural development of the ancient Orient has undergone a change in the course of the last three decades, and this has brought about a decided alteration in our understanding of Israel's religious and cultural history. It is no great discredit therefore to Wellhausen himself and no serious charge against his school of followers that his cunningly devised theory has been rendered obsolete by the progress of Old Testament investigation. Rather is it a cause for general gratification that scholars have been able by continued artful use of pen and spade to force open more of the secrets of the reluctant past and to pour in light upon new fields of knowledge. And it must be admitted that very much of the stimulus to the investigations along these new lines is owing directly to Wellhausen's hypothesis. The artful edifice has broken down under the weight of time but there is still much work to be done in carrying away the ruins. The historical background in which Wellhausen viewed the development of Israel consisted of Arabian poets of pre-Mohammedan times, Mescha stones and so forth. That the historical background for Old Testament scholarship of to-day is a very different one is manifest at once from the frequent use that Old Testament scholars to-day must make of such names as Taanach, the Tell-el-Amarna tablets, the code of Hammurabi, and the constant reference to Babylonian and Egyptian civilization. The work of the archaeologists in Palestine, Egypt, and the Mesopotamian Valley goes steadily forward and the conclusions from their finds are hard to escape. A whole new world of thought has opened up before the investigator. The religio-historical construction of the Kuenen-Wellhausen school was satisfactory enough in its day but it has failed in all its parts to satisfy the

requirements of the rapidly progressive Old Testament sciences. It has failed as signally as Baur failed when he applied the same speculative scheme to the religion and literature of the New Testament.

This decline of the Wellhausen theory concerning the history of Israel and the origin of Israel's religion has begun to entail its consequences in the sphere of literary criticism. In fixing the age and composition of the individual literary sources of the Old Testament, Wellhausen was influenced largely by his pre-conceptions of Israelitish history. The recent progress in our knowledge of the ancient Orient is certain therefore to bring about a revision in the literary criticism of the Old Testament. For there is always a close relation between the literary history and the religious history of a people.

Already the change has begun. From various quarters the Wellhausen division of Old Testament sources is called into serious doubt. Current periodical literature as well as the latest books leave no doubt that a decided transition is in progress in the sphere of the literary criticism of the Pentateuch. The use of the divine names can no longer serve as an undisputed criterion of sources. Nor can the variation in the name of the third patriarch be regarded as an absolutely safe guide for the division of documents. This forsaking of the Wellhausen position as to the origin of the Pentateuch has proceeded much more rapidly in Holland, England, and America, than in Germany. Still the signs of the times in Germany point in the same general direction. They may be seen in such standard works as Kittel's *Geschichte des Volkes Israels* of which the first volume of the greatly enlarged second edition has just appeared. Sellin (in the two works mentioned above and in *Die Theologie des Gegenwart*) and König (in various recent works and now most recently in an article *Ein Blick auf die neueren Kämpfe um die Religionsgeschichte Israels* in the *Allgemeine Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung* of Sept. 6, 1912), also support the contention that the Wellhausen scheme of literary criticism deals too sparingly with the older sources from which the chief streams of the Pentateuch take their rise. And yet these older sources are the most trustworthy evidence of the antiquity of Israel's true religion. Sellin thinks that the entire criticism of the Pentateuch is in need of complete revision and that this revision will

show many portions to be much older and much more complicated than we to-day might dream.

One step in this direction of revision is a recent book by Prof. Eerdmans of Leyden, *Die Komposition de Genesis*, 1909. Until the appearance of this book Eerdmans was known as a strict follower of Wellhausen. But he introduces this work on the composition of Genesis with the words: "In this treatise I renounce the critical school of Graf-Kuenen-Wellhausen and oppose myself to the general modern hypothesis concerning the origin of the documents." He first takes up the question concerning the Priest-code in the book of Genesis. Step by step he seeks to refute the arguments usually employed to prove the existence of such a code and its post-exilic origin. Then he turns his attention to the prophetic narratives in Genesis and argues that it is utterly impossible to maintain the customary sharp distinction between the eloistic and jehovistic sources of the narratives. His positive arguments need not concern us here. Suffice it to say that his work is a classic witness to the fact that the Wellhausen theory of documents in its present form has failed permanently to satisfy one who has hitherto been its earnest advocate. Eerdmans may be regarded as the herald of a thorough revision along the whole line of Pentateuchal literary criticism. Other books of recent date voice the same general dissatisfaction with the critical hypotheses now in vogue, especially with the four-source theory. Such is the recent book by Wilhelm Möller, *Wider den Bann der Quellenscheidung*, 1912. Such also are the publications of Ad. Zahn, Rupprecht, et alteri. But this work is still in its beginnings, at least so far as German scholarship is concerned.

Eerdmans has also applied his iconoclastic efforts to the book of Exodus, *Das Buch Exodus*, 1910. Eerdmans is a scholar whose writings receive a reading, and while the great majority of German scholars refuse to endorse either his method or his results, yet he has not passed unnoticed. He has suggested real problems for the literary critics. For he has shown them that the final word on the form of the Pentatuch has not yet been said, and already they have returned to work over the entire problem anew.

Eerdmans receives warm commendation in an incidental notice of his work in an article in the September number of the

*Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift.* The title of the article is *Naht ein Umschwung in der Pentateuchkritik?* and this question the author, Johannes Dahle, answers with a very emphatic affirmative.

In this connection attention may also be called to a work by another Dutch theologian. Dr. A. Troelstra, a Reformed pastor at the Hague, publishes in Dutch, a series of lectures delivered at the University of Leyden, entitled "The Organic Unity of the Old Testament." The first of these lectures has been translated into English in the July number of the *Bibliotheca Sacra*. Troelstra also attacks the position of the Wellhausen school with reference to the literary composition of the Old Testament. It is a significant fact that these two scholars of Leyden should thus follow in the tracks of Kuennen and prepare the antidote for his errors. But it is a sign of the times.

While the facts which we have pointed out seem to point very directly to the dawn of a reconstruction period in the history of Old Testament science, yet it can not be denied that the Wellhausen school has had a permanent influence in this sphere. It is clear that the old Hengstenberg-Keil conception of the Old Testament has passed forever. Theologians all along the line recognize to-day the right and duty of historical criticism as applied to the origin and religion of Israel and their literary documents. It is the permanent merit of the liberal critics that they brought this right and duty to the clear knowledge of all parties, and to Wellhausen and his school in particular is due a large measure of the stimulus to the positive reconstruction which happily is now the order of the day.

Gettysburg, Pa.

## ARTICLE IX.

## REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

AUGUSTANA BOOK CONCERN, ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

*Daily Meditations upon the Epistle Lessons of the Church Year.* By Rev. F. Hammersten. Translated from the Swedish. Pp. 635. Price \$1.50 post paid.

This fine volume is a valuable addition to the devotional literature of our Lutheran church in the English language. It contains a "Meditation" for every day of the year. Each meditation is based on a brief passage of the Gospels or Epistles. They are all short, seldom covering more than a page and a half, and ending with a brief prayer of a single sentence or two embodying the personal and practical application of the truth emphasized.

The author, Rev. F. Hammersten is a well known minister of the Church of Sweden, and is Court Chaplain. The "Foreword" has this to say of him and of these "Meditations": "Sincerely pious, of a deep spirituality, and strictly Lutheran in his doctrinal conceptions, he unfolds, simply and clearly, the cardinal tenets of our Christian faith. The attentive reader, whatever his progress in the Christian life, will not fail to find the instruction, admonition, or consolation of which he may stand in need." From our examination of the volume we believe that these earnest words of commendation are well-deserved, and can heartily recommend it to all who realize the need of such a help in their private devotions. The quiet, thoughtful, and prayerful, reading of one of these brief meditations each morning could not help but prove a very profitable and stimulating spiritual exercise. They might also be used with great profit in connection with family prayers.

In these days of strenuous living, prevailing worldliness, and a nervous haste after earthly good and the pleasures of this life, we all need more than ever to begin the day with at least a few minutes of quiet thought on spiritual things, and an upward look towards the hills from whence cometh our help. The daily use of such a manual will be a great assistance in this by tending to concentrate the mind, quickening thought, and stimulating devotion.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

*The Lutheran Sunday School Hand Book.* By Rev. J. R. E. Hunt. Pages 291.

This book is rather a novelty in this day of insistence on the

things that make for church unity and the pushing into the background of the points of denominational difference. This book insists on the Lutheran point of view and, indeed, the point of view of the General Council. A very good statement of the principles of religious teaching is given—the work of the schools, the justifications and duties of the officers, of the teachers, are treated and a rather short summary of the elements of educational Psychology closes the book. Most of this would apply to any Sunday School, but the Lutheran point of view is kept to the fore.

The difference between Lutheran Sunday Schools and other Sunday Schools is due:

1. To the differing attitude to the baptized child. The Lutheran regards him as regenerate, but to be trained in Christian Grace and to develop a strong Christian character. The other Sunday Schools regard him as unconverted and endeavor to convert him.

2. The Lutheran Sunday School must lay strong emphasis on Luther's Small Catechism and endeavor to lead the child to the catechetical class of the pastor. The author is afraid that most Lutheran Sunday Schools are woefully remiss in this respect.

3. The stress laid on the authority of the pastor and a corresponding lowering of the authority of the officers and the teachers. The pastor "is to speak as the oracle of God." He "should have the authority in saying what books and literature shall be used." He "has the right and duty to see that only genuinely sound literature be used." The teacher apparently must confine himself strictly to the text book furnished in his work.

FRANK H. CLUTZ.

HORACE WORTH COMPANY, BOSTON.

*Moral Leadership and the Ministry.* By Edward E. Keedy.

Pp. 200. Price \$1.25 net.

This is the author's second book in a somewhat similar line. The first one was published in 1902 under the title, *The Naturalness of Christian Life*. Of that volume the *Outlook* said at the time, "This book from one of the younger ministers of the Congregational body, is for substance of thought and form of expression such as to create high expectation of future products of his studies."

The promise thus referred to is well fulfilled in this new book. It is full of virile thought expressed in a good, vigorous English that makes it fairly tingle with life and inspiration. Mr. Keedy maintains that religion, meaning thereby the Christian religion,

has all the qualities necessary to make those who profess it, especially its ministers, a very superior class of persons morally and spiritually, who would thus naturally come to be recognized as leaders in the communities in which they live. He also maintains, however, that the ministry has largely lost, or failed to gain, this moral leadership which is their natural heritage, and their exalted privilege, as well as their sacred duty, because they do not well exemplify in their characters and lives the truths and principles of the gospel which they preach, and especially because they are too largely lacking in that spirit of self-surrender, and self-sacrifice, and heroic devotion to duty, which are prime requisites to all moral leadership.

The closing chapters on *The Power to Constrain and Lead*, *The Leader's Program*, and *The Training for Leadership*, are a ringing call to the ministry to show more of the heroic, martyr spirit, which is really essential to success in all great enterprises, and which is displayed by multitudes of men in purely secular business, but of which the work of the Christian minister is more worthy than any other work in which men can engage. To be recognized and accepted as a moral leader the minister must not only preach the truth but he must so live the truth which he preaches as to convince men that he is sincere, and earnest, and that he is motived in his work by an all-consuming passion for goodness and righteousness, and for the salvation of souls and the glory of God.

Mr. Keedy may sometimes be a little extravagant in his statements, and his fondness for epigrams makes him a little obscure occasionally, but certainly no true minister can read this book without a sense of spiritual quickening, nor without a desire to be more worthy of his high calling and his grave responsibility.

We quote a single paragraph from Chapter V, pages 146 and 147, "Teaching and preaching are conditioned as to force, as well as to content, by personality. A sermon is the transcript of a person. Every genuineness acts with its own weight. No bad man can really preach. That is he cannot transform life by what he declares. Solomon is the standing warning of the futility. The remedy for ineffective preaching is to glorify the life. The sermon is no weightier than the preacher. The office no greater than the officer. The message no weightier than the messenger. The force of Jesus' words was in himself. Preaching is but an incident to the minister's work. To live the truth is that to which he is called."

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

THE GRIFFITH AND ROWLAND PRESS, PHILADELPHIA.

*Miscellanies.* In two volumes. By Augustus Hopkins Strong, D. D., LL. D. Pp. Volume I 494. Vol. II 504. Price per volume \$1.00.

Into these two volumes the venerable president of the Baptist Theological Seminary at Rochester, New York, has gathered a large number of addresses, sermons, and essays, delivered or read on various occasions during the last twenty years or more.

As announced on the title page Volume I consists chiefly of Historical essays and addresses. While these will be of interest chiefly to Baptists they will not be without interest and value to the members of other denominations. Especially is this true of those which deal with educational problems, particularly as related to our theological seminaries.

Volume II is made up almost entirely of sermons delivered on various special occasions, and addresses to the graduating classes of the Rochester Theological Seminary from 1900 to 1912.

Both volumes are characterized by Dr. Strong's well known vigor of thought and clear and forceful style. Considering the size and make-up of these two volumes they are a marvel of cheapness.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

MASPETH PUBLISHING HOUSE, NEW YORK.

*The Philosophy of the Future.* By S. S. Hebbard. Pp. 251.

This is apparently not Dr. Hebbard's first essay in the philosophical line. On the title page he is credited with the authorship of "Philosophy of History, The Secret of Christianity, The Science of Thought, etc." Some very complimentary notices of his "Philosophy of History" are quoted on the advertising pages.

In the "Preface" to this volume on "The Philosophy of the Future," Mr. Hebbard informs us that it has cost him "more than half a century of toil and the loss of most things that men chiefly desire." On every page it bears evidence of wide reading, and of familiarity with the various systems of philosophy which have had their vogue in the past as well as with those that are claiming our attention today.

It is rather startling to find a man undertaking, in a duodecimo of 250 pages, to overturn all the philosophies both of the past and of the present, and to build up on their ruins a new "Philosophy of the Future." Nothing less than this, however, is the task to which this author soberly and confidently sets himself.

The principle on which he relies for success in his under-

taking is announced in the very first paragraph of the book, which is as follows:

"The principle upon which I seek to found a new philosophy is this: the sole essential function of all thinking, as contrasted with feeling, is to discriminate between cause and effect."

This principle is then applied in turn to the solution of the problems of "Causality," "Abstraction and Relation," "The New Realism," "Space," "Time," "The Concept," "Judgment," "Induction," "The Existence of God," "Freedom," and "The Demonstration of the Soul's Existence," in as many chapters. The whole course of the discussion is marked by the mangled remains of Plato, and Aristotle, and Spinoza, and Descartes, and Kant, and Hegel, and Hume, and Hamilton, and Leibenitz, and Lotze, and a host of others of more or less fame either in the past or in the present, down to and including Bergson, one of the latest to loom large above the horizon. This may sound a little sanguinary, but as nearly every philosopher who has ever written has been like a man playing at ten-pins, with the systems of all his predecessors and contemporaries for pins, and has claimed to make a "ten-strike" with every ball rolled, why not Mr. Hebbard?

How far Mr. Hebbard is correct in his premises, or justified in his conclusions, can be determined only after a careful reading and study of his book, and even then there will likely be a wide difference of opinion. The difficulty we have found is a lack of clear definitions and processes of reasoning. Take the very "principle" on which he founds his entire system, that "the sole, essential function of all thinking, as contrasted with feeling, is to discriminate between cause and effect." Nowhere is there a clear statement of the author's notion of causality, or exactly what he means by discriminating between cause and effect as the "sole, essential function of thinking." It is difficult, therefore, to follow his discussions, or to test the validity of his principle as he applies it to the solution of the problems taken up in the successive chapters.

That Mr. Hebbard himself is assured of his success, however, is evident from many passages like the following:

"Thus we have reached a theory of space and time which seems to answer conclusively all the objections ordinarily urged against their reality. And I now add as a decisive confirmation of this theory the fact that *there is no other theory.*" Page 87, under the discussion of "Time." The italics are in the book.

"Thus we have unravelled those two intertwined perplexities that for thousands of years have made the concept a subject of constant dispute and uncertainty." Page 111, under "The Concept."

"But against this advancing tide of scepticism we have now

presented an impregnable defense. First we have shown that the deterministic arguments all spring from a sophistical denial of causality, by reducing it to a mere sequence. Second, that the four positive proofs of freedom all depend upon and derive their cogency from a proper interpretation of the causal principle." Page 184, from the chapter on "Freedom."

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

EATON & MAINS, NEW YORK.

*Historical Setting of the Early Gospel.* By Thomas Cuming Hall, Professor of Christian Ethics in Union Theological Seminary, New York. Pp. 171. Price 75 cts. net.

This is a very interesting and helpful little book. It is evidently not intended for scholars so much as for the average Bible reader and student. The style is simple and direct. Yet the book is as evidently the result of much scholarly reading and research, and the average pastor will find in it much that will help him to a better understanding of the Gospel and the Gospel message, and to a right understanding and interpretation of the other early Christian literature.

No one can understand or interpret such a movement as the founding of the Christian church, without a knowledge of the time and circumstances in which it took place, nor understand and interpret such a body of literature as we have in the New Testament without knowing its "setting," the conditions under which it was written. Such a knowledge this book aims to give in seven chapters with the following titles, "The World Then and Now," "The Political World of Jesus's Day," "The Economic World of Jesus's Day," "The Religious World of Jesus's Day," "Christianity and Economics," "Christianity and Politics," "The Church in the House." There are two additional chapters on "The Changing Gospel Hope" and a "Summary."

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

*The Recovery of the Ancient Orient.* By Robert William Rogers, Ph.D., (Leipzig), Litt.D., LL.D., F. R. G. S., Professor in Drew Theological Seminary. Pp. 57. Price 25 cts. net.

In the "Foreword," Dr. Rogers informs his readers that this was the Phi Beta Kappa address, delivered by him at Allegheny College, Meadville, Pa., on June 17th, 1812. The address is an interesting account of the beginning and progress of the excavations in Egypt, Babylonia and Assyria, and of the new light thus thrown on the history of Greece. The work is well done, as would be expected from one who is as familiar with this subject as Dr. Rogers, and who has written as much on related topics.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

*Egypt to Canaan, or Lectures on the Spiritual Meaning of Exodus.* By A. H. Tuttle. Pp. 286. Price \$1.00 net.

The title of this book is sufficiently descriptive to give a good idea of its contents. It consists of sixteen sermons, or "lectures" on the Exodus. They are expository in form and the general purpose, as stated in the preface, is "to draw from Israel's pilgrimage the divine meanings which will help us to interpret the mysteries of our own." The work is admirably done.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

*The Apostles' Creed, An Examination of its History and An Exposition of its Contents.* By Henry Wheeler. D.D. Cloth. Pp. 200. Net price 75 cts.

Dr. Wheeler has done good work in this little volume, which sets forth the history and the contents of the universal creed of Christendom. The thought is clear and the language lucid. The treatment is scholarly and devout. The Christian layman will be edified by its perusal quite as much as his pastor. Indeed, the volume was "not written primarily for scholars, but for the mass of intelligent people who in public worship reverently recite the Apostles' Creed as a confession of their faith."

The Creed can not be valued too highly. It is an epitome of Christian teaching, that has found an abiding place in public worship, and has done much in various crisis periods to preserve the faith of the Church.

Dr. Wheeler finds no fault with the Creed. He accepts it, loves it, and explains it with reverence. As far as I can see he is in accord with our common faith. On the descent into hell he does not quite reach the comprehensive view of the Lutheran Church. To him the article means that "while his (Christ's) body was buried in the earth, his spotless soul went into the habitation of holy and pious souls till the time of his resurrection." This is true, but not the whole truth. The Scriptures plainly teach that he preached to the spirits in prison—the spirits of men and evil spirits, proclaiming no doubt his complete victory over all evil.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

*The Synoptic Problem.* By Doremus Almy Hayes, Professor of N. T. Interpretation in Garret Biblical Institute. Cloth. Pp. 87. Size 4 1-2x7. Price .35 net.

In this little book is compressed the result of the perusal of many thousand pages. Christian pastors will be glad to have this *multum in parvo*. It states fairly and clearly the Problem and its difficulties, the greatness of which are felt by all scholars,

and which has called forth many treatises. A single example of the immense amount of work done in this field appears in the volume, entitled "Studies in the Synoptic Problem," which was published in 1910 and embodies the labors of a Seminar formed in the University of Oxford. It met nine times a year for sixteen years!

No satisfactory explanation of all the differences and coincidences has been reached nor is any such in prospect. Our author says: "We are thankful for all the differences there are in the Synoptists, as far as these bear testimony to the multiform impressiveness (of Christ's personality). We are thankful to believe that the substantial historicity of the synoptic narratives has not been shaken by any research, and that it has approved itself through all the Christian centuries."

J. A. SINGMASTER.

*Some Moral Reasons for Belief in the Godhood of Jesus Christ.*

By George P. Mains. Cloth. Pp. 88. Price 35 cents net.

This is a very useful little book in the line of popular apologetics. It presents a moral and a historic argument for the Deity of Jesus Christ. It finds the New Testament to be a reliable story. It shows the impression made by Christ on his immediate disciples, sets forth his sinlessness, his oneness with God, and his unique teachings. All this leads to the inevitable conviction that he is exactly what he claims to be—the Son of God. His age and environment alone were inadequate to produce such a Person. The Christ of History can be none other than the Christ of God. This conclusion is emphasized by the Historic Results and the Abiding Power of His Personality.

We commend this book to those who may be skeptically inclined. Pastors and other Christian teachers will find in it a means of strengthening doubting Thomases.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

*Religious Education in the Home.* By John D. Folsom. Pages 190. \$0.75 net.

A plain straightforward statement of the results of child study and psychology as applied to the religious side of a child's life. There is none of the technical language or "jargon" that make many a treatment of these subjects almost a sealed book.

Parents who wish that their children should grow up in the "nurture and admonition of the Lord" will find it a good guide—probably much simpler to read than to follow, since reading is easier than living. The chapters take up the methods by which children may be led in the right way, and follow their growth, but the influence of the parents' lives is recognized as the moulding one.

F. H. CLUTZ.

*Dynamic Christianity.* By Levi Gilbert. Pages 403. \$1.50 net

The editor of the Western Christian Advocate feels very deeply the recurring and reiterated charge that the church is losing its power. In this volume he gives his diagnosis and his remedy. It is a call to the simple life religiously. He believes that in the multiplicity and complexity of our present life we are losing sight of the essential in the variety of small interests, that we are scattering ourselves on so many different interests that our energy is dissipated, that in running after the new we forget the tested and proved.

"There must be a return to the clear recognition that the religion of Christ depends for its effectiveness and triumph upon a divine, super-natural power, defying all naturalistic explanations. Christianity is the religion of power. Its earliest apostles were to be endued with power from on high. That pentecostal endowment is the indispensable requisite of the Church in every age. That power, proceeding from God through Christ and creating its own specific product has manifested itself through the centuries in the re-creation and radical transformation of human lives. It is mysterious, inexplicable, but undeniably real, self-attesting—an emanation from the Almighty."

We must each gain a vivid realizing sense of the presence of the indwelling Christ and then with a purified vision and a true standard we will live lives of power.

F. H. CLUTZ.

*The Underworld and the Upper.* By Charles A. Starr, with an Introduction by William Jennings Bryan. Crown 8vo. Pages XVI-253. \$1.00 net.

This is a short account of the lives of some of the men converted at the Jerry McAuley Water Street Mission and the Hadley Rescue Hall. There are perhaps thirty of them, men who were down and out, a few victims of drink, most of them drinkers and some of them desperately criminal. The stories tell of them before and after conversion and the change is marvelous. They did not all become saints at the very first, but every one held out. It is worth noting that every man took a decided, open stand for his Saviour at once after he accepted him. These accounts make us long for the time when the power shown may be turned against the sources of so much that is told of downfall and wretchedness; drink and gambling are the two most insistent.

F. H. CLUTZ.

*The Theology of a Preacher.* By Lynn Harold Hough. Pages 269. \$1.00 net.

Dr. Hough has recently become pastor of the Mount Vernon Methodist Episcopal Church of Baltimore. The title of this volume has somewhat perplexed the reviewer since first looking at it, and yet he has not been able to find a better. It does not fit in with the mental picture of a theology. The book is not large—only about 200 reading pages and the publishers have been generous in type and margin. There is not a reference nor hardly a quotation. The stately and sonorous latin derivations that are so much a part of the subject are conspicuous by their absence. In the chapter on "The God of the Preacher" the heads are—"is a Person;" "is the Author and Upholdere of all"; "is a God of complete and perfect knowledge"; "is a God of flaming ethical life"; "is a God of infinite love"; "is a God with boundless richness of life."

In reading, it strikes you that it is exceeding well done and then that much thinking and much living lies back of this little book. It reads easily and fluently, but before long you feel how much it has been compressed. Page after page you will not find a word you could omit without changing the meaning. There is no hesitancy. The subject has been thought upon until the superficial has been all cut away and only the essential left and, hence, the result is clean cut. The steps have been carefully arranged. It might be used almost as a syllabus.

Dr. Hough knows the New Theology and has sympathy with it, but he sees no reason why it and the facts of the old Theology should not dwell together. The philosophy and metaphysics of the old Testament do not mean much. He is an active man among men and the supreme test of his theology is that "it shall be human," shall meet the tests of actual life and experience. The preacher must have lived it himself and so be able to make other men live it—"Not what academic faults can you find with it? but How does it work as a key to life? is the penetrating question."

"The preacher-theologian rejoices as he approaches his tasks. He has an experience which meets his deepest need. He has a message which will speak to every mental and emotional and moral and spiritual outreach which has a place in the lives of his people. He has a world-view which interprets all of life about the commanding personality of the Son of God and his sacrificial death—a world-view which conserves and expresses all which is called for by the great interests of the life of the race."

Dr. Hough believes that every living, thinking man must work out a proclamation of his Theology and this is his.

F. H. CLUTZ.

SHERMAN, FRENCH &amp; CO. BOSTON.

*The Rise of the Modern Spirit in Europe, A Story of the Pre-Reformation Age in its Social, Scientific and Literary Aspects.*  
By George S. Butz, Ph.D. Cloth, pp. 293. Price \$1.25 net.

This book is composed of lectures delivered at Lancaster, Pa., in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church in the United States on the Foundation of the Swander Lectureship. An appreciative foreword is contributed by Dr. Richard, Professor of Church History in the Seminary.

The era covered by these lectures is that of the Renaissance and Humanism, when the mind of man received a marvelous quickening with the glorious final result of the Protestant Reformation. "It was an age," our author says, "of *genesis*, when new energies were born and set in motion! it was an age of *renaissance*, when old forces that had long lain dormant or inert or passive, suddenly revived and became intensely active; and it was an age of *synthesis*, which gathered up into itself and transmitted to the coming ages, under new forms, the best spiritual and cultural elements of two distinct eras of civilization, the ancient Classic and the mediaeval Christian,—in fine the elements the fittest to survive in the fierce struggle for supremacy of opposing and inimical cults, systems, tendencies and ideas, at the commencement of the modern age." The modern European spirit, in which of course America shares, is contrasted with the ancient order "in the social, scientific, and literary spheres."

The purpose of the author is to present a bird's-eye view of a vast movement in history. It was impossible for him to do more than this within his prescribed limits. He presents his matter under five general heads: The Dawn of the New Era, The Renaissance in Italy, Humanism: Its Glory and Its Shame, Humanism in Germany, and The Complete Emergencies of the Modern Spirit.

A vast amount of material is pressed into a brief compass, but so intelligently is this done that the chapters are coherent and lucid. A very extensive Bibliography is appended showing the rich field from which the author gleaned. His thorough study of his subject is evident on every page. The style of composition is fine and pleasing.

The book is handsomely gotten up, and very cheap at the selling price. It is a stimulating and informing volume which deserves a wide circulation.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS. NEW YORK.

*Biblical and Theological Studies* by the Members of the Faculty  
of Princeton Theological Seminary, published in commemora-

tion of the One Hundredth Anniversary of the Founding of the Seminary, 1912. Cloth. Pp. 634. Price \$3.00 net.

The essays included in this stout volume are not the product of the recent centennial celebration; but have been gathered, if we mistake not, from the Theological Reviews. At all events the first essay is Dr. Patton's inaugural address delivered several years ago. But this volume is nevertheless worth while, both for its contents and for the assurance of the orthodoxy and ability of the Princeton Seminary Faculty.

Dr. Patton's article on "Theological Encyclopaedia" outlines his topic under three heads: Thesis, Antithesis, and Synthesis. The first includes 1. Rational Theology (Science of Religion, and Philosophy of Religion); 2. Scriptural Theology (Higher Criticism, Lower Criticism, Exegesis, and Biblical Theology); 3. Ecclesiastical Theology (Church History, Church Organization, Church Work and Worship).

The second head, Antithesis, includes, 1. Polemic Theology and 2. Apologetic Theology. The third head, Synthesis, includes 1. Ethics, and 2. Dogmatics. The discussion is on the whole sane and sound. The trend of it may be seen from the following paragraph:

"Give us the Incarnation and Resurrection of Christ, then Sin, the Atonement and Justification follow; and you have a Dogmatic and Systematic Theology. But eliminate the Incarnation, and then your religion is an emotional morality connected with the name of Jesus, of whom you still speak in the language made sacred by long use and early association; but in its last analysis it is a moral philosophy in competition with other moral philosophies, and defended by a theistic metaphysic that has to cope with another metaphysic which denies God, or makes no distinction between him and the works of his hand."

Dr. Patton's article is a suitable introduction to the volume, covering a wide range of theological thought—critical and practical, embracing philology, exegesis, history, biography, apologetics and dogmatics. There are fifteen essays in all, giving evidence of fine scholarship and humble Christian faith. In so large a volume one might hope to find a discussion of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, which has never received adequate treatment especially in comparison with the works on the Person and the Work of Christ.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

BIBLIOTHECA SACRA CO. OBERLIN, O.

*The Higher Critical Quandary: A Correspondence with Drs. Briggs and Driver.* By Harold M. Wiener, M.A., LL.B.  
This pamphlet is a reprint of the correspondence between Mr.

Wiener and the editors of the International Critical Commentary, touching Dr. Skinner's denial of the importance of variant readings in the text of Genesis in the latter's volume on that book in the series. The controversy is one which would have to be referred to a jury of textual specialists for an adequate judgment as to its merits.

H. C. ALLEMA.

CENTRAL PUBLISHING HOUSE. CLEVELAND, O.

*The Antiquity of Hebrew Writing and Literature, or Problems in Pentateuchal Criticism.* By Alvin Sylvester Zerbe, Ph. D., D.D. 8 vo., pp. xxiv, 297. \$1.50, postpaid \$1.62.

The title does not adequately describe the contents of this admirable volume. It is true, the author's thesis is the antiquity of Hebrew writing and literature which he maintains in an erudite discussion of the origin and advancement of the Hebrews generally, and of the linguistic possibilities in Moses' age in particular. But that statement by no means compasses what the author has here given us. For example, in the first two chapters he has given us an admirable digest of the positions of the traditional and the critical schools. A little later follows a chapter on the origin of the scientific alphabet which would make an admirable reprint in itself. In his chapter on early Semitic inscriptions he assembles in brief form the contributions of archaeology in that field from the Moabite stone to the Samaria ostraca. Not less thorough is his historical discussion. More facts are collected here with regard to the origin and history of early Hebrew literature than in any other single volume of which we have knowledge. Whether we are satisfied that Prof. Zerbe has established his thesis or not, we are sure that whoever absorbs the contents of this volume will be informed on the subject. If the minister could have but one book on the subject, *How We Got the Books of Moses*, we should recommend this one.

H. C. ALLEMA.

FLEMING H. REVELL CO. NEW YORK.

*The Religion of Science, The Faith of Coming Man.* By James W. Lee, Author of "The Making of a Man." Cloth. Pp. 304. Price \$1.50 net.

The purposes of this book is "to point out that no fresh reasons have been discovered in the nature of God, or in the nature of man, or in the nature of religion to make it necessary for the

preacher of the present day to live in any the less intellectual commanding quarters than he formerly occupied." Science must not be limited to a discovery and orderly arrangement of mere physical and material phenomena. It must include in its perceptions all facts—material, mental, moral, and spiritual. The universal experience of mankind confirms Christianity, and the true scientist can not and will not ignore it. Investigation will disclose at the center of things, not a blind force, but a Living Person, whose manifestation to men is Jesus Christ.

There never was any conflict between science and religion properly understood; but only in recent times has it become clear that science is the hand-maid of religion. The pretensions of the former to exclusive rights to human respect have yielded to the saner position that science is a process of thought, an attempted explanation of the relation of things. Science, therefore, in its broadest scope, must include an investigation of the deepest experiences of the soul. In the progress of its investigations, its ablest students have found that religion is not a fancy, but a great, undeniable and blessed fact, and that its purest form is to be found in Christianity, the absolute religion.

Mr. Lee writes in a thoughtful, convincing manner, and his book will strengthen the convictions of the Christian reader.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

*The Dry Dock of a Thousand Wrecks.* By Philip I. Roberts, with an introduction by John Henry Jowett, D.D. Cloth. Pp. 212. Price \$1.00 net.

This book is a vivid record of some of the good work done in the McCauley Water Street Mission, which for about forty years has been the scene of an unremitting spiritual activity in rescuing and rehabilitating the vilest of sinners, especially the victims of strong drink. It is conceded by the best medical doctors that drunkenness is much more a moral than a physical disease. Hence, recovery is possible only through the regeneration of the heart. The remedy offered to the poor human wrecks which drift into the mission is a crucified and loving Savior. The well-told chapters and the photographs of men, now clothed and in their right minds are a convincing testimony to the power of divine grace to rescue men from the "horrible pit." The book is a strong apologetic of the Christian faith, and deserves a wide circulation.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

THE WESTMINSTER PRESS. PHILADELPHIA.

*The Man with a Conscience.* By Charles Roads, Author of "Abnormal Christian." Cloth. Pp. 233. Price \$1.25 net.

This is a timely book in that it lays strong emphasis upon right living in the varied relations of life in these complex days. It shows the character, the functions, and the need of conscience. What one is to do amid the perplexities of real and apparent duty must be determined by the lofty standard of right as it appears in the Scriptures and in the life of Jesus, interpreted and applied by conscience. We all know in a general way what is meant by conscience; but its definition is not easy. We have found the following the most satisfactory: Conscience is the attitude or the action of the mind in the domain of morals.

Dr. Roads applies in a most practical and searching manner the principles of conscience to a multitude of the phases of life—personal, political, family, social, business. He holds up the Golden Rule as a norm in our dealings with others. The acceptance and practice of this rule would settle many of the ills of life

J. A. SINGMASTER.

FORBES &amp; CO. CHICAGO.

*Lame and Lovely, Essays on Religion for Modern Minds.* By Frank Crane. Cloth. Pp. 215. Price \$1.00.

This charming little volume, from the pen of one of our most popular essayists, is really a collection of lay sermons, in which there is not a dull line. The title is derived from a saying of Charles Lamb and is the subject of one of the essays, the gist of which is that our imperfections and lapses draw us nearer to one another. The essay on "The Universal Creed" is full of sound sense. It consists of such things as this: A belief in the difference between right and wrong; Happiness is conditioned on doing right; Development of one's Personality is a man's first duty; He must be strong, clean, brave, loving and ready to serve. "On Going to Church" has the right ring. "First the Church is the oldest organization on earth. It antedates masonry; no family tree has roots so deep; no existing dynasty is so venerable. It is comforting to get hold of something that has stood through the centuries. In my little meeting-house I claim membership and unity with that Church, whose altar-fires Moses built in the wilderness, whose services were held in the Catacombs of Rome in the reign of Nero, whose lofty cathedrals grace Milan and Cologne, and whose weekly gatherings still take place in every

city and hamlet of the world." Church-goers according to Mr. Crane, are the best people in the world, and he wants them as friends and companions for himself and his children. The Church develops the religious feeling and keeps alive "one's idea and feeling of God."

Nearly fifty practical topics are touched and illuminated by Mr. Crane in his inimitable and epigrammatic style.

J. A. SINGMASTER.



## Books Which Every Lutheran Should Read

### The Lutheran Monograph Series

A new series of timely books for popular reading at popular prices.

### The Distinctive Doctrines of Lutheranism

By A. G. VOIGT, D. D.

Our doctrines are stated so clearly and simply that they can be grasped by every reader. It is a valuable contribution to the understanding of Lutheran doctrines.

### Present Day Lutheranism

By F. P. MANHART, D. D.

Anyone who wishes to understand the actual situation in the Lutheran Church to-day as regards doctrine, polity and synodical organizations will find it all here in a nut shell.

### Is the Ministry an Attractive Vocation?

By DAVID H. BAUSLIN, D. D.

A new edition of this stimulating booklet as a number of the Lutheran Monograph Series. It may now be secured at a great reduction in price.

### The Miracles of Christ

By the late MILTON VALENTINE, D. D., LL. D.

This monograph is a reprint of Dr. Valentine's lucid and powerful discussion of the nature, the place, the proof and the evidential value of miracles in an argument for Christianity, which was contained in Volume I of his "Christian Theology." Many who cannot possess the larger work will welcome this masterly extract.

Single copies, 5 cents; 50 cents a dozen, net.

### The Nature of God

By JOHN A. HALL, D. D.

These chapters are given as the answer of Christian faith to the inquiry, "What is God?" They show the failure of philosophy adequately to answer that inquiry. The author insists upon the divine revelation of Scripture. Many illuminating paragraphs set forth the deep things sometimes hard to understand. One lays down the book with quickened pulses and ardent faith.

\$1.25 net, postpaid

### The Post-Apostolic Age and Current Religious Problems

By J. B. REMENSNYDER, D. D., LL. D.

Modern progress has cleared up many things, but it has not shaken the central pillars of Christianity. The book contains a general discussion of the time succeeding the apostolic age, and the doctrines taught, and finds that primitive and modern Christianity are essentially the same.—*The Advance*.

The author has read many authorities on the subjects he discusses and his book abounds in valuable quotations. He writes in a pleasing style, and the reader will receive many helpful suggestions from the comparison of the doctrines and usages of the time following the Apostles and those of the Protestant period. In this respect the work is unique, and an original contribution to modern apologetic literature.—*G. W. Richards, D. D., in the Reformed Church Review.*

\$1.25 net, postpaid

### The Lutheran Catechist

By G. H. GERBERDING, D. D.

This volume has a legitimate place without crowding upon others, for the literature of catechetics in English is not extensive. Doctor Gerberding writes out of his experiences as a pastor for nearly twenty years and as a teacher of prospective preachers for nearly as long a period. The book has been prepared with scholarly thoroughness and with practical ends ever in view. It shows wide reading on the literature of the subject, and will confirm the Lutheran Church in the wisdom of its catechetical practices.—*The Lutheran Observer.*

\$1.50 net, postpaid

SEND US YOUR ORDER FOR ANY BOOK  
ON THE MARKET

THE LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY

1424 Arch Street, Philadelphia

51

